DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 990 HE 015 155

AUTHOR Salley, Charles D., Ed.; And Others
TITLE The Future of Institutional Research. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research (Orlando, Florida, October 24-26, 1979).
INSTITUTION Southern Association for Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 82p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Association for Institutional Research, ADM 214, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL 33620.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Adult Education; Collective Bargaining; College Administration; College Faculty; *College Planning; College Students; Decision Making; Educational Change; *Enrollment Trends; *Governance; Higher Education; *Institutional Research; Management Information Systems; Political Influences; Prediction; Researchers; *Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Research Problems; Self Evaluation (Groups); Statistical Analysis; Student Attrition; Student Recruitment; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the 1979 conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR) are presented. The conference theme was the future of institutional research. Contents include reports of preconference workshops, speeches, panel reports, abstracts of papers, and reports pertaining to the affairs of the SAIR. Documents and authors are as follows: "The Relationship between Institutional Planning and the Future of Institutional Research" (President's Message)," (Norman P. Uhl); "Proliferation, Fragmentation and Politicalization: Institutional Research, in Transition or in Disintegration?" (Keynote speech, Marvin W. Peterson); "Past, Present, and Future of Institutional Research" (Panel, Edwin R. Smith, Moderator); "Integrated Approach to Marketing at a Land-Grant Institution" (Panel, Emmett T. Kohler, Moderator); "The Budgeting Process in a Steady State Economy" (Panel, Fletcher F. Carter, Moderator); "Recruitment and Institutional Research in the 1980's" (W. Kevin Hunt); "Identifying Adult Educational Needs in a Rural Community" (Carol A. Kayla, James M. Hoey); Non-Academic Factors Influencing the 'Withdrawal' of Academically Ineligibile Black Students" (Timothy R. Sanford); "Voluntary Withdrawal: Why Don't They Return?" (Ellen M. Ironside, Timothy R. Sanford); "The Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in Institutional Research" (Donald J. Reichard and Norman P. Uhl); "Computerized Enrollment Driven Financial Forecasting Model" (John R. Sarvella); "A Comparison of Research Techniques Used in the Collective Bargaining Process" (Stephen W. Ahrens); and "Concerns in the Selection of an Appropriate Data Source: A Critical Aspect of Institutional Research" (Ellen I. Posey, Donna L. Sylvan). (SW)

ED218990

THE FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

edited by
Charles D. Salley
Suzanne W. Larsen
Mary A. Roberts

ANNUAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
OCTOBER 24 - 26, 1979
ORLANDO, FLORIDA

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SAIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NE 015 155

ANNUAL CONFERENCES

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Atlanta - 1974	Compliance Reporting--Policies and Procedures for Compliance
Atlanta - 1975	Information for Decision Making
Atlanta - 1976	Current Issues and Research Efforts in Institutional Research
Atlanta - 1977	The Institutional Research Interface with Data Suppliers and Data Users

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Nashville - 1978	The Relationship Between Institutional Planning and Institutional Research
Orlando - 1979	The Future of Institutional Research

Copyright © 1979 by the Southern Association for Institutional Research

PREFACE

The proceedings represent the second annual meeting of the Southern Association for Institutional Research. The preparation of this document was directed largely by Dudley Salley with the very able assistance of Mary Roberts. Both of these people are employees of the Office of Institutional Planning at Georgia State University. Georgia State, through Joe Ezell, Glynton Smith, and many other staff members, has given considerable assistance to the growth of this association through the years. These proceedings afford an opportunity to express our appreciation.

This year's Conference was organized around the expressed wants and needs of its members. In the SAIR meeting at the 1979 Forum the members discussed topics of interest and importance to them. The program and workshops for this Conference were structured to meet those requests by my very capable program committee consisting of Richard Howard of West Virginia University serving as chairperson, Charles Brown of Fayetteville State University, Jerry Gehre of East Tennessee State University, Archie Johnston of Tallahassee Community College, and Dudley Salley of Georgia State University. The success of the Conference was due to their capable contribution, the strong leadership of our president, Norman Uhl, and the excellent planning and facilities provided by the local arrangements committee chaired by Ilona Turrisi of Florida State University and including Denise Strenglein of the University of South Florida and Joshua Williams of Florida A & M University. A special thanks goes to Brenda Sealey for handling the many details required by a local arrangements committee and for the other Florida State staff who stepped in to give a hand when needed.

The program was a success because of the excellent participation of so many of the members of SAIR as well as that of other outstanding educators and administrators who contributed their time and shared their experience and knowledge in selected areas. A highlight of the Conference was the address of our keynote speaker, Marvin Peterson of the University of Michigan.

Many of the papers presented have been submitted to ERIC and will be available from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education.

The Conference was a success because so many of you chose to be in attendance.

Suzanne Larsen
University of Tennessee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND THE FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH (President's Message) Norman P. Uhl	1
PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS	3
PROLIFERATION, FRAGMENTATION AND POLITICALIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, IN TRANSITION OR IN DISINTEGRATION? (Keynote Address) Marvin W. Peterson	5
PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH (Panel) Edwin R. Smith, Moderator	27
INTEGRATED APPROACH TO MARKETING AT A LAND-GRANT INSTITUTION (Panel) Emmett T. Kohler, Moderator	28
THE BUDGETING PROCESS IN A STEADY STATE ECONOMY (Panel) Fletcher F. Carter, Moderator	29
TABLE TOPICS SESSION I Student and Enrollment Papers	31
TABLE TOPICS SESSION II Methodology Papers	43
TABLE TOPICS SESSION III Management and Evaluation Papers	53
ORDERING INFORMATION FOR THE ERIC COLLECTION OF SAIR TABLE TOPICS PAPERS	58
MINUTES OF THE SAIR ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING E. Michael Staman	59
APPENDICES	
Constitution and Bylaws	61
Roster of Members	66
Conference Program	76

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND THE FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Norman P. Uhl

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND THE FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

A recent study conducted by the Educational Testing Service and summarized in Findings[1] found that opinion leaders at almost every level of postsecondary education are deeply concerned about three things: (1) the growing power of federal, state, and local governments to influence policy at educational institutions; (2) the measurement of the quality of postsecondary education; and (3) the development of new modes of institutional governance and management. At many postsecondary educational institutions these concerns, coupled with more stringent fiscal policies, have provided the impetus for developing more formalized planning systems.

This trend of more formalized planning systems places greater emphasis on the use of institutional research in decision-making. However, it is dangerous for institutional researchers to assume that all administrators will be aware of the vital contributions that institutional research can make to the planning process. The best procedure for institutional researchers to follow is to disseminate information that will assist administrators in making decisions. A formal planning system provides for a better understanding of the data that will be needed for decision-making. As an illustration, one of the first steps in planning is to develop assumptions regarding not only the campus environment but the environment external to the campus. Providing the data on which the assumptions are based is the responsibility of institutional research. These data include not only student and faculty characteristics and institutional strengths and weaknesses, but also results of needs assessments, national enrollment trends, and any other research relevant to the problems of the institution. Also, as part of the planning process, goals are identified and procedures developed to attain these goals. It is important to the institution to know how well it is achieving these goals and here, again, institutional research should play a major role.

---

[1] Wild, Cheryl L., Forta, R., and Knapp, Joan. "Identifying Issues in Postsecondary Education." Findings, 1979, 5(2), 5-8.

If the office of institutional research makes significant contributions in the above two areas of planning, it will provide an indispensable service to the institution and the results of the research will have a direct influence on decisions made at the institution. Most institutional research offices do not have the personnel to perform much of the research dealing with external (noncampus) variables. However, since it is needed, an important service that can be performed is to identify, evaluate, and disseminate to appropriate administrators and committees significant pieces of research done by other researchers and agencies. Remember, realistic planning cannot take place in a vacuum--missions, programs, goals, and strategies must be developed with a thorough understanding of such things as the assumptions being made, the characteristics of the present faculty and the students to be served, the probable enrollments, the demand for present and future programs, the human, fiscal, and physical resources that will be required to support the programs, the conditions in the larger society, etc. Good planning cannot occur without good institutional research. Since planning is becoming more important to institutions, institutional research should have a bright future. Marv Peterson, in his excellent keynote address, discusses this future for institutional research.

Pre-Conference Workshops

This year the SAIR conference program expanded to include three workshops. These areas of professional development were a response to requests made at the SAIR special interest group meeting at the 1979 AIR Forum in San Diego.

COLLECTING AND REPORTING DATA FOR INSTITUTIONAL SELF STUDY

Time: 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon; 1:00 - 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 24

Staff: Larry G. Jones, Associate Director, Institutional Research and Planning, University of Georgia
James R. Montgomery, Director of Institutional Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
F. Craig Johnson, Professor, College of Education, Florida State University

Description: The purpose of this workshop is to review the data requirements of each of the eleven accreditation standards and to examine the options for collecting, analyzing, and reporting the data to document institutional stature, accomplishment, and progress.

WRITING ABOUT RESEARCH FOR RESULTS

Time: 1:00 - 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 24

Staff: Charles F. Elton, Professor, Higher Education, University of Kentucky
Dudley Salley, Research Associate, Georgia State University
Gerald W. McLaughlin, Associate Director, Institutional Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Description: The purpose of the workshop is to provide the participants with 'hands-on' experience in presenting the results of research in different modes for different audiences. This workshop is designed for the institutional researcher who is already familiar with the techniques and methodologies which are used to obtain the results themselves. It focuses on structuring and restructuring the reporting of those results.

A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO PROBLEM-SOLVING AND DECISION-MAKING

Time: 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon, Thursday, October 25

Staff: Jerry L. Gehre, Assistant Director, Internal Research, Systems and Planning, East Tennessee State University

Description: This workshop is designed to provide institutional researchers and planners with a systematic approach to problem-solving and decision-making. On the one hand, it provides a model for individuals to use in analyzing problems and making decisions. On the other hand, it provides an insight into problem-solving and decision-making which will enable an individual to better prepare information for policy-level administrators.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

PROLIFERATION, FRAGMENTATION AND POLITICALIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, IN TRANSITION, OR IN DISINTEGRATION

Marvin W. Peterson

PROLIFERATION, FRAGMENTATION AND POLITICALIZATION:
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, IN TRANSITION, OR IN DISINTEGRATION

Introduction

My initial response to Suzanne Larsen's invitation to address the SAIR meeting was both enthusiastic and uncertain--enthusiastic because I have numerous good friends and respected colleagues in this group and have heard about the strength of SAIR as a regional group; uncertain because I didn't know what the concerns of the membership were--particularly as you addressed your theme of the "Future of I.R." using a good anthropological strategy, I decided to get some expert advice to help me map the territory.

First I consulted with the top of the authority structure--your President Elect Suzanne Larsen--she assured me you were a loose collegium of professionals for whom no one could speak. I first interpreted loose to be a descriptive networking term, but after last night's social affair, I have to ask Suzy if this describes your social relationships. She did assure me you were from large and small, public and private institutions, represented diverse educational backgrounds, and had a broad range of I.R. interests including all aspects of the future. Armed with that bit of explicit information, I proceeded.

Then, I sought the political system's astute observer and called Jim Montgomery. He referred me to Jim Firnberg--SAIR's Commissioner of Controversial Issues. They agreed to call a caucus of SAIR's interest group leaders. They later informed me the timing was wrong, the issue was too hot to handle in an election year, and they couldn't reach a position on the future.

The historians or archival picture seemed another important perspective, so I consulted two SAIR regulars, Joe Sutton for the organizational memory of the association and Ilona Turrisi who chairs AIR's Archives Committee. I received a detailed account of past parties and social events and plans for future ones--reassuring me of the intense camaraderie and one likely future direction.

Next I sought the rational analytic answer--turning to the mystical master of statistical analysis and interpretation of data bases--Gerry McLaughlin. After factor analyzing the SAIR membership characteristics, he found a significantly disparate cluster on all dimensions. He agreed to run a further rotation--and when last seen was still rotating.

Finally, I sought the philosopher's answer from our AIR president--Craig Johnson. It took some time to reach him as he was in meditation receiving visionary advice about the future of AIR; when I finally broke through the transcendental barrier, he spoke to me of "catastrophe theory." I came down from the upper midwest thinking things were better in the south, but alas--perhaps not.

A Symbolic Acronym and a Perspective

What I do bring to you today is the lesson recently confirmed by social scientists, and one that a current NCHEMS study suggests college presidents see as a key problem facing higher education today, i.e., the need for a positive symbol--a theme or acronym around which the membership can rally and which the outside world will believe. For your consideration I suggest SAIR FUTURE. Lest you think that's original, let me assure you I borrowed it from the window of a campus adult book window display entitled: Swinger's Future.

THE SAIR FUTURE:	THE SWINGER'S FUTURE:
Formulating (or is it fantasizing?)	Fantasizing
Ultimate	Ultimate
Techniques	Techniques
Underlying	Underlying
Research and	Romantic
Evaluation	Eroticism

Seriously, the future of I.R. is a far more critical topic than my prefabricated anthropological advice, and acronyms do not help us perform effectively. The theme for your meeting was partially brought into focus at the San Diego Forum in May. Bud Hodgkinson's major address dealt with many broad issues facing higher education in the 1980's, and suggested implications for I.R. Bob Wallhaus, in his presidential address, and the

past presidents, in their panel, sounded the need for greater emphasis on academic and qualitative issues. I believe these will all be reprinted in the Forum Proceedings for those of you who were not present and I commend them to you. Their insights, with which I largely agree, are all based on a common assumption with which I concur, namely, that I.R. is in a transitional phase. This transition is critical and may affect the profession as a whole, the practice of I.R. at the institutional level, and individuals in their career development and growth. My comments today will focus more closely on my view of the nature of the transition than did the San Diego presentations and suggest some implications for all three levels--but particularly institutional practice.

In examining the future of I.R. from this perspective, it is useful first to examine the development of I.R., then to look at some current changes in the immediate institutional environment of higher education and examine the implications for the practice of I.R., and finally to suggest how that affects the profession and each of you as members of that profession. I essentially see I.R. as a professional field in three phases--a period of emergence in the 1950's and 60's, a period of consolidation in the 1970's, and beginning recently and extending into the 1980's in a period of transition, coping with problems of proliferation, fragmentation, and potential politicalization. In each of these phases, I.R., as an institutional function, is adapting to a changing set of institutional pressures and the association's development mirrors the needs of the growing number of people in I.R. activities.

1950 - 1970: The Emergence of I.R.

The studies by and writing about the field by institutional researchers, and the forum papers and publications of the AIR, portray the period from the 1950's to approximately 1970 as a period of emergence during which institutional research developed many of the characteristics of a professional or quasi-professional group (see Table 1). The focus of the Association, both in professional meetings and in writings, reflects many debates about the role, function, and status of I.R. Members attended meetings as much to share problems and identify peers as to share formal papers and studies. Most I.R. officers were new to the task, came from varied fields of study

(but predominantly the social sciences), had prior experience in administrative or teaching assignments, and often were learning their job as they went. Their titles and institutional status were often under debate and even the more established offices were shifted on occasion. The nature of the institutional research that was practiced at the institutional level was seeking its identity as an institutional process (see Table 2). The structure of I.R. both in terms of institutional status and in terms of its clarity as an institutional process was changing - emergent. Studies during this era were focused mostly on specific, separate, and differentiated issues that were of limited scope. Methodology reflected limited methods and descriptive studies that were quantitative in nature. Interest in building data bases was quite limited and focused on internal data sets. The content of the studies was limited and reflects the management problems of a rapidly expanding institution--the need to refine enrollment data, analyze space needs and utilization, and analyze budgets. The concerns about institutional size and student discontent in the 1960's reinforced the need for more educational research, institutional self studies, and student research. There was a strong rational orientation to the research and a view that I.R. was somewhat an independent process or function. However, an early debate over the role of institutional research as a management-oriented function or as an objective, critical function continued throughout the era.

1970 - 1980: The Consolidation

While the exact boundary years are unimportant, the decade of the 1970's marks the consolidation era for institutional research as a profession (see Table 1). On most campuses the office and its role and function became firmly established or consolidated; new areas of content and methodological specialization were integrated into growing offices; the relationship of the I.R. office to various other institutional offices became more clearly defined; the association itself, growing steadily, gave less attention to debates about the nature and role of I.R. (although it is always an open subject) and gave more attention to strengthening its executive office, adding publications for professional exchange, expanding and improving national forums, workshops, and relations with other associations, even developing ties to

governmental agencies and international groups. Persons working in I.R. offices now identified AIR as their primary association and looked to it for a professional outlet for their work as well as participating in its activities for personal development. While people entering I.R. still came from diverse fields, directors were now individuals with substantial experience. The office on most campuses was formally established as a second or third echelon position in the administrative hierarchy, new staff increasingly were either trained for I.R. or research positions in an academic program or had intensive on-the-job training in large offices. Staff during this period increased in quantitative sophistication and research skills as individuals with management, operations research, computer science and other fields joined the previous experts, adding to the specialized and quantitative nature of the field.

I.R., as practiced on campuses, reflected its quantitative bent by its orientation to research (see Table 2). However, I.R. officers began to define themselves more publicly as part of the management team of their institutions. I.R. studies remained focused on specific and differentiated issues--although admittedly on much more diverse topics and problems. However, studies were expanded to include active roles in development of management information systems, cost analyses, use of sophisticated projection methods, resource allocation modeling and analysis, and studies of faculty. These studies reflected a more comprehensive array of research methods, and descriptive and analytic research of a more specialized nature, but primarily quantitative. Interest in comprehensive M.I.S. development grew and even data exchange for comparative studies was initiated. Lyman Glenny lumped I.R. with the growing array of "technocrats" in higher education.

The reality is this growth and consolidation of I.R. mirrors the slowing institutional growth rate and increasing pressures for more prudent financial management and accountability. Once the NCHEMian dilemma, "To count or not to count" was resolved, this period of expanding I.R. expertise was one in which the I.R. function was consolidated or integrated at the institutional level and the association was resolving the problems of organizing the profession.

A Review

Admittedly there is no clear demarcation between the consolidation of a profession and its embodiment in institutional practice. Similarly, individual institutions will vary in the degree to which they have (or ever will have) a consolidated office or integrated network concept of institutional research capable of conducting the array of studies suggested. However, before examining the current pressures and the future, it is helpful to recap five key dimensions of I.R. practice development over these two eras (see Table 2):

1. First, while I.R. draws on varied disciplines and methods, the field and institutional practices have moved increasingly toward a consolidated or increasingly integrated view of structure of institutional research process.
2. Second, the focus of studies and nature of methodology, while reflecting a comprehensive array of topics and methods, have also led to higher degrees of specialization--either in terms of differentiated staff or in studies designed around very specific problems with specialized methods.
3. Third, the emphasis of most institutional research and, indeed, some of the basis for its integration are the highly quantitative methods and orientation.
4. Fourth, the studies conducted rely heavily on internally collected data or comparative data from similar institutions.
5. Fifth, the orientation of most I.R. work has attempted to be rational or objective in research style but is now primarily management oriented in the institution in terms of topic selection.

While these are brief and highly generalized views of I.R.'s development over the past two decades, they provide a basis for examining some pressures on postsecondary institutions which are beginning to affect the practice of I.R. and may change it substantially in the future.

Changing Conditions: Their I.R. Implications

For three decades, I would suggest, institutional research has been an adaptive process (i.e., it has served a major function in assisting its parent institution in changing or responding to major problems and pressures). In so doing, the process itself has adapted, as has the profession. My premise in discussing the future of I.R. is that its vitality will be determined by how well it senses and responds to the new problems and conditions affecting our institutions. The broad trends and their implications for I.R.--

enrollment and demographic declines and shifts, declining fiscal support, declining public and governmental confidence, accountability demands, and growing competitive practices in higher education (by traditional and non-traditional institutions)--are well-documented and were presented at the Forum in San Diego. Here it is suggested that four currently changing conditions will affect the nature of how I.R. is structured and practiced, and that five institutional problems or issues which reflected the broader trends of the 1980's and are the likely focus of future studies, will affect both the methodology and content of I.R. studies.

Changing Condition 1: Technology and Data Availability. The rapid advances in design of MIS's, the recent developments in minimal micro computing, and the passage of certain legislation in virtually all states have changed/or are changing some of the underlying data technology and availability. The growth and acceptance of the concept of a comprehensive MIS (including standardized data definitions, analytic indices, and procedures), despite their shortcomings, are here to stay and will be expanded and refined. Data about the institution is a more available commodity for all constituents (not just I.R. officers). An institution struggling with whether or not to develop some MIS concept is dealing with an outdated issue. I.R.'s involvement with this area in the future should be more limited but no less serious as refinements are made. The advent of "sunshine laws" and "freedom of information laws" have insured access of many to data and heightened sensitivity about what is maintained and what studies are done. Further minimal micro-computing is now being introduced on college campuses--beginning to offset or complicate the emphasis on large scale data bases maintained on single computer systems and housing all analytic systems. This is an advantage to small campuses who now can have their own systems--often modeled on others. On larger campuses the blessings are mixed as individual units begin to maintain their own data bases and analytic capability. The primary implications are that the interaction of these MIS, legal, and computing advances create a paradox. They make the dispersion of data easier and the proliferation of I.R. activities more feasible. However, particularly for the larger institution, that process may lead to fragmentation, duplication,

or competitive efforts unless the MIS system is well understood and followed and analytic studies are more carefully coordinated.

Changing Condition 2: Administrative Sophistication and Staff Analytic Capability. During the past five years, the control that the I.R. office or other administrative office has had on analytic studies has weakened. Increasingly, administrators at all levels, even at the executive officer level and in the academic affairs area, have caught "management fever." They have had conferences, workshops, and consultants on the topic. They have even begun to hire staff based on this expertise. This includes more emphasis on data and analysis. While many administrators probably overreacted at first to MIS, cost data, other analytic studies as panaceas, that seems to have been replaced by a more realistic acceptance that data and analytic studies are useful, by a willingness to question and criticize such studies (they are no longer awed or cowed), and even by a tendency to initiate their own. Administrators who are willing to encourage analytic studies, who are sophisticated in critiquing and using them, and who will hire staff to do studies are likely to increase. Whether their motives are seeking better answers, merely rationalizing increasingly difficult decisions, or engaging more effectively in political battles, I will leave to you.

The implications for I.R. are the likely increased proliferation of the I.R. process. This can be viewed either as potentially reinforcing fragmentation or as furthering democratization and acceptance of more I.R. which merely needs better coordination. However, in adversarial situations (e.g., in larger universities with different deans doing their own studies to justify a stable or increased share of shrinking resources), it may place those doing I.R. in more adversarial or advocacy roles--a politicalization of I.R. if you will. The combination of increased information system acceptance, analytic capacity, and administrative sophistication when applied to difficult decision issues may all be part of the "new poker game." Data may not affect decisions greatly, but one needs more sophisticated studies just to be heard.

Changing Condition 3: State Coordination and Governance. There is a deceptive tone to changes in state coordination and governance these days. After three decades of growth and increased power and responsibilities, state governing and coordinating boards seem less stable. Several states (e.g., Alabama and South Carolina) have evaluated and others plan to evaluate their boards, state board budgets have been slashed or eliminated (e.g., Colorado and Nebraska), other states are reassessing their statewide governance structure (e.g., Florida, Louisiana, West Virginia). These attacks on state boards and/or reassessments, which are likely to continue, should not be seen as less interest in state control or more potential decentralization or institutional autonomy. It is more important to examine individual coordinating functions. First, in budgeting, state budget officer's analytic staff size has grown but legislative fiscal and education staff size has grown more rapidly. A decreased state board of higher education role in budgeting may be the result of the political ascendance of these others. Also as these groups begin to recognize that simplistic workload and efficiency measures did not keep higher education budgets down in the 1970's and as they politically seek to justify the quality of state services to which public funds are allocated, state officials are examining qualitative and quantitative performance measures in the budget process, reviewing legislative intent, and flirting with revised formulas, ZBB, performance budgets, and other techniques which require a more varied array of analytic and budget perspectives. Second, in statewide planning there is increasing emphasis on developing or revising institution mission, role, and scope statements instead of the more general state plans of the 1960's and 1970's, they are forcing institutions to focus and often constrain or prioritize their activities. Third, in perhaps the fastest growing area of state level involvement, program review and evaluation is being taken seriously. While much of it is done under the direction of a state higher education agency (e.g., New York, Florida, Louisiana), increasingly the state auditor or a legislative audit committee is involved in program-oriented, performance evaluation (not just fiscal or management audits). The reviews focus on issues of quality as well as need, duplication, cost, etc. Since state-level program review is increasingly a mechanism for program elimination or

reduction, the institutional implications are extensive. Fourth, underlying all of these functions, making data access and I.R. studies at the state level easier for budgeting, planning and program review. Thus, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of state higher education coordinating or governing agency is not the key element in understanding the gain or loss in institutional autonomy--analysis of the state control by functions is more helpful.

The implications for I.R. seem clear. More parties are becoming involved in doing I.R. and analytic studies for these functions and are likely to be involved in decisions affecting the institution. Those state level groups--executive, legislative, or higher education agency--all have increasingly skilled analytic staff and available data. Issues of quality--heretofore resisted by institutions--are being addressed by state groups forcing institutional responses. The pressure to reduce state expenditures and the political perspectives of these various groups are likely to add tension to differing state versus institutional views of the major allocation, planning and review decisions. Institutional research staff are at once called on to supply state information yet increasingly called on to provide analyses which advocate institutional positions or criticize the studies and positions of the other parties.

Changing Condition 4: Institutional Governance. The position of I.R. in institutional governance has been debated in terms of two dimensions: first, its independent (i.e., servant of all constituents) or its management orientation; and second, its neutral/objective or advocacy stance on research. There are changes in institutional governance, which are likely to continue, that would suggest an increased emphasis on a management orientation and on an advocacy role. The expansion of collective bargaining which recently slowed shows signs of rekindling as resources tighten. Whether associated with collective bargaining or merely the pressures of difficult reduction decisions, strains between faculty and administration, between administration or faculty and board members, or among groups of administrators or faculty in areas of differing priority are contributing to increasingly centralized decision making on many campuses or divisive governance struggles. Under such conditions there will be strong pressure to further centralize the I.R. function, to

make it more management oriented and perhaps to stress its advocacy role in dealing with staff, agency and faculty issues. The fragmenting forces on I.R. noted earlier may politicize it further, reinforcing the management and advocacy role of the central I.R. office.

These four changing conditions suggest some challenging paradoxes and strains for institutional research in the decade ahead. The potential for expansion and democratization of I.R. within the institution at different levels of governance and administration are exciting, yet it raises questions about excessive proliferation and possible fragmentation. The varying parties involved in I.R. from different levels suggest diverse new perspectives to enrich informed decisions--yet these are potentially politicalizing and divisive and tip the balance of institutional level I.R. toward a management and perhaps advocacy perspective. The difficult decisions which have caused outsiders to take seriously questions of performance and quality, challenge us to work on them--yet the quality issue is, in itself, potentially divisive.

Institutional Problems and I.R. Implications

Turning now to five institutional problems which reflect trends of the 1980's, these will have priority and say something about the content, focus, and methodology of I.R. in the future. Let me mention each briefly.

Problem 1: Institutional Planning. After a disappointing foray into institutional planning in the early 1970's (usually defined as a formal process for creating a plan and using quantitative resource simulation and projection models), colleges and universities seem now to have accepted the need for better planning (defined now as a more flexible process for relating the institution and its resources and capabilities to the changing external demands and to devise or revise institutional strategies for retaining a vital and productive institution). Planning suggests a variety of analytic studies in several areas which are often obvious:

Environmental Scanning: studies assessing the social, political, economic, legal, and educational competitive spheres (as well as demographic) for factors that affect projections of institutional resources and that reflect underlying assumptions about their trends.

Values Assessment: Studies that attempt to identify the appropriate role, responsibility, and mission of the institution. Analyses of charters, legislation, institutional impacts on external groups, the expectations of internal and external constituents.

Self Assessment: Studies that identify institutional strengths and weaknesses in performance and functioning--particularly as those relate to possible institutional directions and/or strategies.

Needs Assessment: Studies that go beyond demographic projections and market interest surveys and attempt to define the demand (both by potential students, by the segment of society for which they were trained, and in relation to competition).

Strategic Assessment: Studies that examine the likely impact and consequences of alternative choices of program, resource, or staffing strategy or of broad institutional policies for the whole institution. Studies of the impact of possible external changes--particularly those affecting resources.

The implications of this planning-related research are primarily that these are generally broader studies than the specific issue-oriented I.R. studies of the past and call for syntheses and/or integrative studies that pull together many dimensions, issues, or sub-studies. Policy or contingency analyses are often stressed. They utilize external as well as internal data bases, qualitative as well as quantitative measures, a wide spectrum of data collection and analysis techniques, and a multiple set of criteria or perspectives.

Problem 2: Program Evaluation. Given state emphasis on program evaluation and the financial pressures on institutions to decide on its priorities and to reallocate resources, program evaluation will continue to be a major institutional activity. In an era when evaluation is not merely formative but may lead to reduction or elimination either by institutional choice or external pressure, the I.R. implications are clear. The design of the process--who is involved and at what stages--is crucial. Program evaluation also generally calls for more varied techniques and measures (qualitative, quantitative, comparative and judgmental) than most typical I.R. studies.

While program review is often carried on in a separate institutional office (part of the fragmentation of I.R.), it is a critical piece of an integrated view of the I.R. function.

Problem 3: Reduction/Closure. Program reduction or closure is essentially an extension of program evaluation--should programs not reviewed favorably or having a lower priority be reduced, merged, or closed? These are complex organizational issues requiring organizational, policy or contingency analysis, and that examine the legal, organizational or administrative, cost, educational, and human impacts of such decisions on both the program addressed and on the rest of the institution. The political dynamics of reduction and closure further threaten to force the I.R. or program evaluation office into a management-oriented and advocacy stance unless the boundaries between analysis and decision making are clearly drawn and the office is skilled in the dynamics of such research.

Problem 4: Concern for Quality: The issue of quality raised by our AIR former presidents at San Diego and reinforced by state-level interests and institutional desires to limit further erosion, suggest that it will be a growing dimension for institutional research. The salient points for I.R. seem to be two. First, we need to make a careful distinction. Are we talking about measures of quality of a program (e.g., the quality of its research as opposed to its quantity?) or about qualitative measures (soft as opposed to hard measures)? Or about qualitative modes of conducting research (e.g., interview studies, documentary analysis)? These are not mutually exclusive--measures of quality can be quantified (student evaluations of teaching); qualitative modes of research can lead to quantitative ratings. However, these distinctions do suggest the need to examine the variables we focus on, our measures of them, and our methods to assess them. In many instances this will substantively expand the arena of I.R. activity.

Second, recognizing the distinction, research which focuses on qualitative measures and methods may raise questions as to its validity which need to be examined. But, research which seeks to measure quality as well will be more controversial. Different parties will have differing definitions and perhaps all are equally valid and they will all lay claim to the

right to make judgments on the data. Thus, institutional research studies, in this arena, will have to deal with multiple notions of quality and may not be able to produce clear-cut studies. The data, the study, and its results will all be controversial.

Problem 5: Faculty and Staff Vitality. Issues of staff vitality and human resource assessment are studied mainly in non-higher education settings and are likely to gain increased emphasis. As financial resources become limited and staff or programs are reduced, the vitality of faculty and staff who stay and continue in new or different roles becomes a crucial barometer of the institution's likely future success. Studies of faculty and staff morale and commitment, performance in new or different roles, evaluations of ongoing responsibilities, and innovativeness and flexibility would seem critical. How these are affected by institutional personnel policies, governance styles, and resource allocation would be of interest. However, whether it is possible to conduct these studies from an I.R. office in an increasingly divided faculty and administrative climate remains to be seen.

Problem 6: Minority Issues. The final problem for I.R. that deserves comment relates to minority issues. The discussion does not refer to affirmative action as it relates to the hiring of minorities and women. This is an important arena and has a strong legal basis and governmental commitment. Neither does it refer to studies of minority student characteristics per se, for that is now getting significant attention. Rather, the concern here is how our predominantly white institutions deal with minorities. In the next decade the percentage of ethnic minority students in the 18-24 year-old age cohort will double to between 20 and 25%--much higher in some states and urban areas. The federal government (and state government) has improved access through improvements of the elementary and secondary system and in financial aid at the postsecondary level. We know the proportions of minorities entering college has increased, but we also know they still drop out at higher rates. Each institution needs to take a closer look at the performance of its minority students (not just entry, attrition, and graduation statistics), at the nature and quality of the programs designed to meet some of their needs, and at their performance after graduation and

views of the institution. In the past, close examination of these was resisted by the minorities and avoided by others. However, it is now apparent they are present in larger numbers and to stay. If there is a priority for educating them, it is time we stated it and began assessing their performance and improving our programs and educational efforts in this area.

There are even broader minority issues for both predominantly black and white institutions. What is the impact of desegregation orders and reorganization in institutions affected by them? What contingency studies can be done anticipating such changes are even more difficult? How does an institution or a system assess its status vis-a-vis the desegregation issue? These are complex, controversial, and difficult issues.

Conclusion

Several themes flow through this analysis of changing conditions and suggest how this transitional era in I.R. affects the nature of I.R. both as a profession and in our institutions in the 1980's.

As a profession (see Table 1) institutional research both benefits from and is challenged by the continued expansion of individuals practicing I.R. This expansion or proliferation in varied institutional offices and agencies promises potential for growth as a profession. The growing array of practitioners with specialized training and research methods promises great potential for new intellectual and professional gains. However, that broad array of specialized training and their dispersed institution status in different functional areas, the fragmentation, suggests that individuals, still seeking professional identification and personal growth, might turn to other associations as their primary membership association. The challenge to the profession is to coordinate the increasingly fragmented interests and provide the intellectual integration of the field and the coordination among its members.

At the institutional level (see Table 2), the implications of the transition are more specific. First, the expansion--or proliferation--of institutional research activity within our institutions and at differing levels of governance and administration is an exciting potential. Yet

it raises a critical structural question: Is the I.R. process in danger of becoming excessively fragmented leading to redundant, competitive, or defensive units? Will it be a coordinated process but consist of structurally differentiated analytic units linked to a central I.R. or planning office? Or will it be centralized in a vertically controlled, management-oriented process (state-wide, campus-wide, school, etc.)?

Second, the diverse array of participants in I.R. even in a single institution suggest new perspectives and research interests which may enrich the process. However, the controversial problems to be faced during periods of constraint and reduction and the natural divisions among governance groups emerging may tend to centralize or politicize the role of institutional research. This suggests a change in orientation in which I.R. offices at different levels become less independent and more hierarchically linked and management oriented, less rational and more advocacy oriented in research studies designed to defend their institution's or unit's best interests.

Third, the type of questions being raised for institutional researchers--both by the outside agencies and the nature of the internal problems requiring institutional attention--suggest a different type of or focus for studies. The research questions deal with broader issues which are often interrelated and cover a variety of areas. These suggest studies which involve a synthesis of or integration of a wide range of studies, the use of contingency studies and policy analyses which go beyond the more specialized and differentiated studies often done in I.R. offices, and organizational analyses of problems involving or affecting many areas of institution.

Fourth, the broader, interrelated issues being addressed and which are more complex research problems have significant implications for the nature of the I.R. research methodology. Individual studies may require a more comprehensive array of methods; e.g., a single planning study or program evaluation might use a variety of research methods. Evaluation as well as merely analytic or descriptive studies are suggested. Quantitative and qualitative measures and methods might be used in a single study. Combinations of projection techniques, survey data, open-ended interviews, analysis or

TABLE 1. INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AS A PROFESSION

	The Period of Emergence 1950's - 1960's	The Period of Consolidation 1970's	A New Transition or Disintegration--1980's
1. Major Professional Focus	Embryonic--debating role and status.	Consolidation--integrating new specializations	Fragmentation/ Coordination
2. Membership	Growing--seeking affiliation	Growing and Continuing-- Primary affiliation	Growing: Secondary/Primary Changing/Continuity
3. Motivation	Sharing problems, discovering peers	Professional identification, self growth	Professional identification, self growth.
4. Training	Varied fields, no formal preparation	Varied fields, increased academic or on-the-job preparation	Varied fields, preparation unclear
5. Institutional Status	Varied, debated	Stable, Second/Third echelon staff	Dispersed/Coordinated/ Consolidated
6. Methodological Expert	General descriptive, quantitative studies	Increasingly specialized, quantitative and analytic studies	Specialization/Synthesizers Quantitative/Qualitative

TABLE 2. NATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN PRACTICE

	Embryonic	Consolidation	Transition
Structure of I.R. Process	Emergent	Consolidated (integrated or closely coordinated)	Fragmented, Coordinated, or Hierarchical
Orientation Pressures of I.R. to			
a. Research	Rational	Rational	Rational/Advocacy
b. Institution	Independent	Independent or Management	Management
Focus of Studies			
a. Issues	Specific	Specific	Broad*
b. Issue Relation	Differentiated	Differentiated	Interrelated
c. Issue Areas	Limited	Many	Many
Nature of Methodology			
a. Variety of Methods	Limited	Comprehensive	Comprehensive
b. Type of Research	Descriptive	Descriptive & Analytic	Analytic & Evaluative
c. Mode of Research	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative/Qualitative
d. Complexity	Simple	Specialized (single methods and multiple measures)	Complex (multiple methods and measures)
Data Bases	Limited, Internal	Comprehensive Internal	Comprehensive, Internal and External
Examples of Content	Enrollments	M.I.S.	Planning
	Costs	Cost Analysis	Institutional and Program Review
	Space	Resource Allocation	Reduction/Policy Choices
	Student Characteristics	Projections	Staff Morale
	Self Studies	Faculty	Minority

* E.G.: Organizational Analyses, Synthesis and Integrative Studies, Policy & Contingency Analyses

operational data and performance measures, legal research, and consensus techniques could all be used in one evaluation study where program closure was at issue.

The fifth, and final implication is that the institutional problems to be addressed cannot be dealt with using internal institutional data alone. Increasingly data--or knowing about its availability from external sources (census, economic data, other institutions)--is a part of the I.R. arsenal.

These insights can be expanded or argued--they may already be reality in some institutions and may affect others little--yet that is the danger of talking about the future. Predicting the "golden mean," even if accurate, is only good in a uniform field of endeavor. I.R. is not. If you agree that I.R. is in a transition and the nature of the conflicts and demands on institutional practice and indirectly the profession are similar to the ones identified, I would suggest that consolidating the profession at a new level of synthesis rather than fragmenting it depends on our rising to these new I.R. challenges, and continuing to share with colleagues even though we represent increasing differing views, research skills, and institutional perspectives on the issues.

I would just close with one piece of advice and one of encouragement--one from Kahlil Gibran and the other from Paul Dressel. It appears we are at a turning point in I.R. The division between an era in which I.R. grew and prospered as colleges and universities sought to enhance their own rationality in dealing with their affairs and an era in which the problems and decision issues embroil us in difficult political and human dimensions where politics and passion may prevail. Gibran's advice is as follows:

> For reason, ruling alone, is a force confining; and passion, unattended, is a flame that burns to its own destruction.
>
> Therefore let your soul exalt your reason to the height of passion, that it may sing;
>
> And let it direct your passion with reason, that your passion may live through its own daily resurrection, and like the phoenix rise above its own ashes. (The Prophet, "On Reason and Passion.")

I trust in finding the balance of reason and passion in practicing I.R. in your institution you will expand not only your research methods and skills, but also your organizational, human, and political ones as well.

And if you are still uncertain or timid about the road ahead, Paul Dressel has recently assured and encouraged us in discussing institutional autonomy in his forthcoming NDIR monograph on that topic: "The Availability of Evidence (Accountability) that our Autonomy is Well Used is the Price of Autonomy." If I.R. provides the evidence that helps your institution maintain its institutional autonomy in the years ahead, it will have been a worthwhile effort: a new level of growth and integration, not fragmentation or divisiveness, for you, your institution, and this profession.

PANEL SUMMARIES

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

INTEGRATED APPROACH TO MARKETING AT A LAND GRANT INSTITUTION: PROCEDURES, ASSETS, AND LIABILITIES

THE BUDGETING PROCESS IN A STEADY STATE ECONOMY

Panel Summary

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Panel — Edwin R. Smith, moderator, West Virginia University
James W. Firnberg, Louisiana State University System
James R. Montgomery, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Norman P. Uhl, North Carolina Central University

The panel of past AIR presidents and the SAIR president discussed several major themes:

1. If you had to do it over, would you enter the field of institutional research?
2. What are the main problems presently facing institutional research?
3. What is your assessment of the relative salary position of institutional research practitioners?

With an eye on past accomplishments, the panelists agreed that institutional research has been a fruitful undertaking. An institutional research office can have great influence on policy when administrators seek information and simultaneously grant the freedom to explore the questions raised and give objective views. The availability of so much data makes the field especially rich for pure research. The future may not be so rewarding, however, since other academic and regulatory areas are beginning to undertake data collection and analysis often without clear objectives.

The immediate problems within institutional research appear to be the growth of external reporting requirements coupled with an inability to retain qualified secretarial and technical staff support. Also, there remain the ever present problems of the reliability of incoming data and the effective communication of outgoing analyses to deans, planners, and other users of institutional research.

More presidents than ever before are seeing the importance of institutional research; the increasing complexity of decision making requires more information. Yet salary increases have not gone to institutional research. The panelists suggested that institutional researchers might research their own roles to advantage. Survival for institutional research in the eighties depends to a large extent on using initiative to become productively involved in major issues. Acceptance by the academic community also involves doing something helpful for the faculty and finding out something positive about the institution and disseminating the news.

Panel Summary

INTEGRATED APPROACH TO MARKETING AT A LAND GRANT INSTITUTION: PROCEDURES, ASSETS, AND LIABILITIES

Panel Emmett T. Kohler, moderator, Mississippi State University
Melodie E. Christal, Mississippi State University
Joyce Hickson, Mississippi State University
Roy H. Ruby, Mississippi State University

In the face of declining enrollment, a question arose whether the decline reflected a recruitment problem or a lack of student retention. Institutional research undertook to find the answer with an integrated marketing approach. This approach broadly assessed Mississippians' attitudes toward higher education generally, their perceptions of Mississippi State University in particular, the reasons freshmen enroll, the reasons some students leave the university before graduation, and the level of satisfaction among graduates.

In a telephone survey, some 400 Mississippians successfully interviewed revealed that the institutions in which they place the most confidence are higher education and the military. There is a preference for smaller colleges over large, a feeling that a student is better off to start at a two-year community college, and that four-year schools are receiving adequate funding at existing levels. Agricultural units are more favored for expansion than are other university units. Few residents of the state knew any specifics about MSU except what they learned from the media, predominantly from football game coverage. The entering student questionnaire found that students chose MSU because of a program of study offered, the school's statewide academic reputation, and the influence of alumni. Only twenty percent indicated that a recruiter influenced their enrollment.

A telephone survey of non-returning students indicated that students withdraw because they lack the funds to continue, need to take a job, or simply want a break from studies. Forty percent anticipate returning within six months.

The mail survey of graduates indicated that about half are employed and about twenty percent are headed to graduate school. The surveys also revealed that many student services such as faculty advisement and the financial aid office are not used by the majority of students.

In sum, the marketing study found the university's image was not bad, but was poorly defined and nebulous. As a result, recruiters now know what information to emphasize for prospective students.

Panel Summary

THE BUDGETING PROCESS IN A STEADY STATE ECONOMY

Panel

Fletcher F. Carter, moderator, Radford University
Edith Carter, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Richard A. Manahan, Radford University
Robert P. Schultze, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Keith Scott, University of South Florida

The spiraling cost of higher education has heightened the concern for accountability and cost effectiveness at colleges and universities. Consequently, accountability and the budgeting process are becoming linked both in private and public institutions.

At the state level, budgeting has come into the limelight because costs have spiraled as well in other public programs whose budgets compete with educational budgets for limited public funds. There is also heightened competition between rural and urban interests. Unfortunately, higher education's ability to compete is diminished by declining enrollments coupled with an oversupply of advanced degrees. Establishing a link between budgeted costs and enrollment is one of institutional research's responsibilities.

Internally, incremental budgeting and formula budgeting appear to be most common since they routinize decision-making. There is some question, though, of the ability of formula funding to deal with declining enrollments.

Community colleges seem to feel budget cuts first since there is a concern for overinvestment in this area. It is important to reconsider the mission of the community college, the priorities for expenditures, and an approach to change by substituting resources rather than by adding resources. Institutional research will either provide information to facilitate such reconsiderations or will itself become a victim of retrenchment. There is a need to anticipate rather than to react.

Federal funds can reach higher education--a state and private prerogative--only by way of student aid and research grants. In the face of increasing demands for accountability, there is a need for institutional research information in these areas, especially to provide a longitudinal perspective.

TABLE TOPICS SESSION I

STUDENT AND ENROLLMENT PAPERS

RECRUITMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE 1980'S

W. Kevin Hunt
Tidewater Community College
Portsmouth, Virginia 23703

Director - Institutional Research
State Route 135
(804) 414-2121 Ext. 391

For the 1980's, enrollment forecasts predict a limited number of potential students, which will mean declining enrollments for some institutions of higher education. In an effort to prevent enrollment losses, institutions are directing special attention and additional dollars toward student recruitment. Traditionally the urgent need to find and enroll new students, all institutional areas are becoming involved.

Because of locality based operations, community colleges could possibly find themselves with a limited student market. In order to attract new students, community colleges will need to implement procedures for identifying potential groups of students within their service area. This responsibility falls directly in the domain of institutional research. For a diverse population, institutional researchers will have to develop and implement evaluation strategies to assist the student recruitment process. Groups of potential students can be identified from aggregated data representative of many facets of the service area in which the community college is located.

The purpose of this paper is to describe a methodology which institutional researchers could implement in order to evaluate the service area of a community college and determine potential student markets. Because of the special nature of examining a specific geographical area, identification of potential students is approached from both the individual and organizational aspects. The methodology emphasises the development of profiles of identified subgroups of potential students, either on an individual or organizational basis. Briefly, the following four major areas comprise the proposed methodology: 1) establishment of identifiable subgroups of potential students; 2) collection of data representative of each of the subgroups identified; 3) evaluation of of the respective subgroups as to potential recruitment, educational needs and attitudes, and relationship with major college programs; and 4) development of recruitment profiles of those subgroups that appear to offer the best possibility for student recruitment.

With financial constraints increasing constantly, institutions will need to concentrate their recruitment activities in those areas which appear to be most productive. Institutional researchers can play an integral role in the student recruitment process by providing information on potential students. With such information, institutional researchers can interact with other administrative personnel in a total institutional recruitment process.

IDENTIFYING ADULT EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY

Carol A. Kayla
Institutional Research Analyst
209 Purinton House
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506
Phone: (304) 293-4906

James M. Hoey
Coordinator and Assistant Professor
Computer Center
Potomac State College of West Virginia University
Keyser, WV 26726
Phone: (304) 788-3011

This paper focuses on an attempt to identify one alternative that would help alleviate a future major problem of higher education, declining enrollment. Enrollment projections have shown a large decline in the number of high school graduates, the traditional population enrolling in colleges and universities. The smaller less prestigious colleges and junior colleges could be most effected by this decline, as competition increases for the available students. Therefore, in addition to the recent high school graduates, these colleges must be prepared to attract the non-traditional student. A successful adult off-campus educational program could mean survival to these colleges.

Recently, Potomac State College, a junior college of West Virginia University, has experienced a decline in full-time student enrollment. A marketing study of adult education interests in the Potomac State College area was conducted by West Virginia University's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the study was to assess the community needs in continuing and traditional educational programs, to discover locations where the evening and off-campus programs could be expanded to serve more students, and to identify new subjects of interest to the adult populations.

This paper will describe the methodology used in surveying a four county area in West Virginia, in which the median years of education completed was only 8.6 for males and with 45% of the population employed in either operative or unskilled labor. Also discussed will be the problems encountered in surveying this rural population. In addition, recommendations which were made to the Dean of the College will be discussed.

A COMPARISON OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND THE OCCUPATIONAL PLANS OF STUDENTS ENTERING A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGE AND STUDENTS ENTERING A PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGE

Linda K. Pratt and Vicki Fuller
Office of Research, Evaluation and Planning
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707
(919) 683-6367

Patricia E. Gaynor
Department of Economics
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608
(704) 262-2'48

The collection and sharing of data have been major emphases of the inter-institutional research group of the Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University (NCC) for several years. As part of the effort, data from routine surveys given at predominantly white and at predominantly black colleges and universities are often compared.

Comparison of two surveys, one given to the 1978 freshman class at NCCU, a predominantly black, state-supported university and the other to the 1978 freshman class at Appalachian State University, a state-supported university with a predominantly white student body revealed one particularly striking anomaly--a large difference in the educational aspirations of the two groups.

The freshmen at Appalachian State were somewhat better prepared academically, with higher average SAT scores (877 as opposed to 707 at NCCU) and tended to rank higher in their high school classes, with 77% of Appalachian freshmen ranking in the top 40% of their high school class as opposed to 39% of the NCCU freshmen. A higher percentage of the parents of the Appalachian State freshmen were reported to have completed high school, a higher percentage had some college training, a higher percentage had completed bachelors degrees and advanced or professional degrees than the parents of NCCU freshmen.

Examining these differences in academic achievement and in family background, one might reasonably expect the NCCU freshmen to have somewhat more modest educational aspirations than the freshmen at Appalachian State. However, the opposite appears to be the case. While 62% of the Appalachian State freshmen indicated that the highest level of education they expect to complete is the bachelor's degree, only 25% of NCCU freshmen expect to stop with this degree (at both institutions, less than 3% of the freshmen expect to complete less than a bachelor's degree); at Applachian State 22% of the freshmen expect to complete a master's degree compared to 46% at NCCU; and, finally, 10% at the Appalachian State freshmen expect to complete advanced professional or doctorate degrees as compared to 26% at NCCU.

Clearly there is a discrepancy between the expectations that society might have for the NCCU freshmen and the aspirations they hold. The paper will examine in more detail this difference; compare the selected majors of the two groups; compare occupational plans of the groups; and explore the possibilities for further research in this area.

It should be noted that 93% of the 1978 Appalachian State freshmen and 84% of the 1978 NCCU freshmen class were surveyed. The NCCU sample was 97% black while the Appalachian State sample was 95% white. The NCCU sample had a somewhat higher percentage of females (63% as compared to 52%). Both groups tended to fall in the traditional 17-22 age group.

NON-ACADEMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING THE "WITHDRAWAL" OF ACADEMICALLY INELIGIBLE BLACK STUDENTS

Timothy R. Sanford, Assistant Director
Office of Institutional Research
02 South Building, 005A
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(919) 933-3071

Students who voluntarily withdraw from colleges and universities are often polled as to their reasons for leaving. Involuntary withdrawals who find themselves declared academically ineligible to return to a given institution, on the other hand, are rarely consulted as to their reasons for leaving. While the academic problem certainly cannot be overlooked, there is reason to believe that academic ineligibility may mask many of the same reasons for withdrawing as are given by voluntary withdrawals. The purpose of this paper is to relate the findings of a small study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in which a small group (22) of academically ineligible black students were surveyed along with a larger group (307) of academically eligible non-returning students to determine their reasons for leaving Carolina. Response rates were 57.1% and 54.4%, respectively. The paper will be presented in three sections.

First, the findings from the survey of the ineligible group will be reviewed and discussed. Briefly, these students considered their poor academic records to be important but did not list their low grades as the most important reason for their withdrawal. The single reason listed by the most respondents was health or personal problems.

Second, findings from the survey of academically eligible students will be used to determine if the ineligible group differs in significant fashion. Preliminary analyses indicate definite differences but a surprising overlap between the two groups. In particular does one see that comments added to the returned surveys are nearly indistinguishable between the two groups of students.

Third, the paper will explore the importance of such a study to increasing an institution's knowledge of its academically ineligible students. This study suggests that academic attrition can be reduced by the sensitive response of an institution in areas of non-academic administration so that faculty need not feel that standards are being lowered in order to retain students. Institutional researchers will be interested in this study both for the intrinsic interest it prompts as a new area of research and for the potential contribution it makes to institutional research operations within an institution's planning and evaluation efforts.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT PERSISTERS AND NON-PERSISTERS AT OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

Lloyd R. Howell
Mark L. Perkins
Suzanne Young
University Planning and Analysis

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
(804) 489-6566

The purpose of this study was to explore the demographic, academic and other college related characteristics of the persisting and non-persisting students at Old Dominion University.

This study was conducted using a snapshot approach focusing on student persistence on a one-year period from Fall 1976 to Fall 1977. Information was collected from the Student Master Registration File for all students enrolled in the Fall of 1976 and was then matched against the Fall 1977 file for the purpose of identifying those students who could be classified as persisters or non-persisters for the one-year period. The most difficult part of any attrition or retention study is establishment of clear definitions for persisting and non-persisting students.

Major findings of this study are as follows:

1. Eight variables characterize the degree seeking persisting and non-persisting student, and they are (a) high S.A.T. math, (b) rank in high school class, (c) high school quality point average, (d) degree sought, (e) ODU, QPA, (f) college major, (g) application status, and (h) housing preference.

2. Nine of the twenty variables characterize the non-degree non-persisting student. They are (a) sex, (b) race, (c) legal residency (out of state), (d) active military status, (e) degree sought, (f) ODU, QPA, (g) application status, (h) time classes are attended (7 a.m. - 5 p.m. or after 5 p.m.), and (i) part-time or full-time students.

3. Demographically, the degree seeking persister and non-persister are similar.

4. Academically larger proportions of the persisters had higher QPA's than the non-persisters.

5. The persisters had better high school performance records than the non-persisters.

6. Larger proportions of the persisters enrolled in the School of Science and Health Professions which has the largest number of student majors in the university.

7. Large proportions of the non-degree non-persisters could be characterized as follows: male, on active military status, and from out of state.

8. Large proportions of the degree seeking persisting students occupied campus housing.

9. Large proportions of non-persisting degree seeking students desired to be placed on campus but were not.

10. The snapshot approach does not adequately address the complexities of persistence and non-persistence.

RETENTION EFFORTS: COULD THEY BE MISDIRECTED

Paul Carney
Betty Tilton
Florida State University
Rm. 424 Westcott
Tallahassee, Fl. 32306
(904) 644-4203

Reports prepared for the University's EEO Subcommittee on Black Student Retention indicated that, although attrition rates for undergraduates at FSU were below the national rate, retention of transfer students at the University appeared to be more of a problem than that of entering freshmen. A review of existing University programs/policies aimed at improving student retention revealed that most of the efforts were geared toward the first-time-in-college student.

Our retention programs with regard to FTIC's appeared to be working (FSU's attrition rate of 24 percent compared to national rate of 32 percent). The decision was made to survey junior college transfers who "dropped out" of the University to determine their reasons for leaving. It was hoped that the results of the survey could be used to improve programs/policies aimed at retaining transfer students.

This paper reports the results of the survey. The students were asked to indicate their reasons for leaving the University and report their perceptions of the University as well. Separate analyses were run grouping respondents into "high," "medium," and "low" GPA components and into "Financial Aid Recipient"/"Non-Financial Aid Recipient."

VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWAL: WHY DON'T THEY RETURN?

Ellen M. Ironside, Research Assistant
Timothy R. Sanford, Assistant Director
Office of Institutional Research
02 South Building, 005A
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(919) 933-3071

Since 1975, annual studies have been made at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to ascertain why students voluntarily withdraw. A particular focus has been to determine whether reasons differ significantly between groups of black and white students. Other variables have also been considered such as sex, age, amount of financial aid, and residency status (in-state or out-of-state). The surveys conducted in 1975, 1976, and 1977 included all students in attendance in a given fall who did not graduate and who were academically eligible, but who were not in attendance the following fall semester. Hence, surveyed groups included students of various ages and classes. In 1978, however, the survey was based only on a cohort of students admitted for the first time in fall, 1977. This resulted in a younger, more homogeneous group (mostly freshmen) than had previously been the case. Response rates for the surveys have averaged about 50%.

This paper deals initially with the findings of the 1978 survey and then compares these findings with the earlier surveys. Most significant is the discovery that race does not appear to be a significant factor. Reasons do vary notably, however, by sex and age. Over the years the most prevalent reasons cited for leaving Carolina were "Needed a break" and "The University was too large and impersonal." Other reasons mentioned frequently were changes in career plans, marriage, health and personal problems, and finances.

One of the most interesting results of these studies concerned student perceptions of the nature of their reasons for voluntary withdrawal--were they personal, university-related, or some of both? This question was asked in 1977 and 1978. More than half of the 1977 group felt their reasons were essentially personal but only 30% of the younger 1978 group felt this way; 35% of this group felt their reasons were more university-related.

Such studies of students who voluntarily withdraw from college have important implications for institutions of postsecondary education. Sometimes they suggest specific changes such as more counseling or improved readmission procedures for stopouts. But more often, the suggestions relate to details of practices and policies which can be easily revised within existing organizational structures. Particularly for the large institution do these studies provide a human perspective of many of the problems that largeness can create, increasing the institution's awareness of the need to be continually attentive to the context provided for the learning experience.

THE USE OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Donald J. Reichard, Director
Office of Institutional Research
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
(919) 379-5930

and

Norman P. Uhl
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
for Research, Evaluation and Planning
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707
(919) 683-6367

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which is based upon Jung's Theory of Type, measures such non-intellective dimensions as extraversion-intraversion, perceptual processes, cognitive style, and preference for order. The purpose of this paper is to describe how data from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator can be used in institutional research. The paper is based upon experience derived from working with data obtained from approximately 2,200 administrations of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator over the last four years at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. General areas in which dimensions of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator have usefulness include the prediction of academic success, the analysis of student retention and withdrawal, selection of academic major, and performance on professional examinations in such areas as Nursing and Education. Ultimately the program of research utilizing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator data may be of assistance in counseling undergraduate students as to selection of major. Another possible outcome of such uses of MBTI data is that individual schools and departments will use non-intellective data as measured by the MBTI as one criterion among several criteria for admission to advanced study in particular majors. To the extent that these uses of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator may help to produce a better match between individual students and their academic majors and increase student retention rates, the study is important to institutional researchers in all institutions of higher education.

A QUESTION OF HONORS: THE BRIGHT STUDENT ON A COMMUTER CAMPUS

Joanne C. Ferriot
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of New Orleans
Lakefront
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122
(504) 283-0204

A superior college student has seldom been a subject of concern for educational researchers. Spurred by government and societal interest in the educationally disadvantaged, researchers have studied and re-studied the characteristics of this group - their background, motivation, level of achievement. The superior student has been left to achieve alone, un-researched. The faculty of my institution, the University of New Orleans, a public urban university, recently restated their alarm over what they had been perceiving as a steady and significant decline in the quality of our student body. Their alarm was substantiated by the fact that over the last six years the percentage of entering freshmen with ACT scores over 27 has declined from 9% to 3%, a far lower percentage than the national average (10%) and the average for the state of Louisiana (6%).

Their concern prompted an examination of our honor student population. Who are they? Where are they from? Do they persist through to graduation at UNO? What majors do they choose? If they leave, why do they leave? Why did they choose UNO in the first place? Do their college records show that they fulfilled our expectations of them? The answers to these questions could influence a) our recruiting procedures b) our major programs c) our honors program d) our scholarship program.

A simple study involved compiling data from the ACT file and student records. The population studied was all students who had received, over the last five years, the two institution-based scholarship awards which are judged solely on the basis of ACT scores and high school grades. Having hypothesized that one reason for the perceived decline in student quality was that we were losing these bright students to other schools once they were attracted, we were surprised by the results of the study. Other results generally bore out our expectations.

Since little published work exists on the honor student in urban, commuter institutions, it would be fruitful for other researchers to undertake similar studies. Given the continually declining test scores of the average student and declining numbers of bright students, it is still more important that we study this rarer being and consider programmatic changes on the basis of the results, to promote excellence and high achievement wherever we can find it.

NEW SCHOOLS IN A STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: HOW DO THEY AFFECT THOSE PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED?

John M. Kalb
Coordinator of Institutional Research
Florida State University
424 Westcott
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(904) 644-4203

This paper studies the development of the State University System of Florida from 1959, before any "new" schools were added to the three already established, the University of Florida, Florida State University, and Florida A & M University, until 1974 two years after the final expansion to the present nine schools of the system.

The method used is to take enrollments from Florida counties and analyze these in terms of distribution to each of the schools in the system. Percentages are used to determine shifts in enrollment patters from counties to schools, absolute numbers being deceptive due to the wide variance in population of Florida's counties and the number of students going into the state university system.

The effect to be studied will concentrate mostly on the three schools already mentioned, however, due to the regional character of the last six schools, some effect will be evident there also.

A NATIONAL STUDY OF UPPER-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS: SOME INITIAL OBSERVATIONS

David P. Bell
Coordinator of Academic Planning
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Houston System
Houston, Texas 77004

The emergence of the upper-level institution on the American college scene represents an attempt to modify and restructure the traditional American four-year baccalaureate that is worthy of investigation. An upper-level institution is one which offers course work at only the junior, senior, and in some cases post-graduate levels. In the past fifteen years approximately twenty-five upper-level institutions with current combined enrollments of some 75,000 students have been created. Although eleven states have upper-level institutions, two states -- Texas and Florida -- lead the nation in the number of such institutions as well as the total number of students served.

For the past one and one-half years, the University of Houston System office has conducted a national study of upper-level institutions, seeking to examine the unique philosophical and operational considerations that guide these colleges. The study has consisted of two separate phases. Initially, a comprehensive set of questionnaires was distributed to all of the upper-level institutions in the United States. This questionnaire addressed such issues as the creation, planning, and opening of the institution; the nature of the relationships with area two-year colleges; the demographic composition of the student body with the resulting special need for various student services; the academic mission and programmatic offerings of the institution; and finally, budgetary and financial considerations. The second phase has consisted of site visits to upper-level institutions for the purpose of clarifying impressions and obtaining additional first-hand information on campus operations. As of this time, eleven institutions in eight states have been visited.

Several observations on the current status of upper-level institutions can be made. (These are explored in greater depth in the actual paper.)

1. Previous informal descriptive accounts of upper-level student bodies have typically used the following words: older, married, employed, evening, part-time and commuting. This study confirmed this profile with specific statistical evidence.

2. The three critical characteristics of this profile, in terms of programmatic implications, appear to be the commuting nature of the student body, the seriousness of purpose of upper-level students, and their place-bound status.

3. The enrollments at many upper-level institutions are currently below original projections, possibly due to the fact that early projections were more politically guided than analytically forecasted.

4. Two discernible phases of institutional growth are noted: one, an initial phase in which institutions were most willing to experiment and innovate and two, a more recent period in which a return to more traditional forms of instruction and organization have emerged. A similar pattern is observed in the presidencies (innovators and consolidators) of upper-level institutions.

5. Finally, the notion is explored that upper-level institutions are striving to more closely resemble other universities in form and substance. Residential aspirations and the desire to add the lower division in some institutions are cited as manifestations of this movement.

TABLE TOPICS SESSION II

METHODOLOGY PAPERS

STUDENT ENROLLMENT FORECASTING TECHNIQUES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Stephen W. Ahrens
Office of Institutional Research
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W.V. 26506
Phone: (304) 293-4906

This paper will attempt to briefly overview the various techniques used by state agencies, secondary schools, community colleges, and large universities to forecast enrollments.

Throughout the paper, various mathematical and causal forecasting models will be introduced and matched with appropriate situations; and, wherever possible, illustrative examples will be provided showing the mathematical equations used, the data required, and the specific assumptions subsumed.

The appeal of this paper will be to the occasional user of forecasting tools and not necessarily to the statistically orientated technician, irregardless, the basic intent is the same - to inform potential users of different forecasting models and of modifications thereof which may be useful in the prediction of student enrollment.

A COMPARISON OF RESEARCH TECHNIQUES USED IN THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS

Stephen W. Ahrens
Office of Institutional Research
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W.Va 26505
Phone: (304) 293-4906

In the space of ten years, the number of states with public employment relations laws allowing for collective bargaining in public colleges and universities has increased from one to twenty-nine. Currently, federal legislation is being considered which mandates enabling legislation re collective bargaining in all states. Already, European scholars are proclaiming that, "collective bargaining between faculty and administration is inevitable." Once a university has been organized, the onerous task of providing research to management, legislators, labor lawyers, professional negotiators, etc. defaults to the institutional researcher. Given the aforementioned, the institutional researcher of the future will not only have to have familiarity with statistical methods, computer software, management information systems, etc; but, also, with the tools common to professional labor organizations (e.g., master contract language, PERB Laws, need arguments, etc.). This study will concern itself with but one aspect of the bargaining process - the types of research that are currently being used in negotiating salaries and fringe benefits for faculty.

Whereas there is no one method used in preparation for impasse proceedings (i.e., fact-findings and final offer arbitration), there are certain general themes or concepts that permeate the negotiation process regardless of the issues; personalities; or public employment laws. The material that will be used in the study will be gleaned from selected boards of regents and offices of institutional research; the countries of France, Ireland and Canada; as well as, the NEA, AAUP, and AFT. Following a brief introduction and review of the literature, exhibits will be prepared around the *NEED*, *COMPARABILITY* and *ABILITY TO PAY* arguments familiar to the bargaining process. These exhibits will attempt to show the similarity and differences used by the various groups,states and countries. Finally, brief narratives will accompany the exhibits explaining the relevance of each; the assumptions that they are based on; and the associated pitfalls.

A METHODOLOGY TO STUDY PROMOTION, TENURE, AND TERMINATION AMONG ACADEMIC FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

William R. Fendley, Jr.
Assistant Director
Office of Institutional Analysis
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Edward M. Brown
Research Associate
John T. Hemmeter, Director
Office of Institutional Research
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

In the spring of 1979, the Office of Institutional Research at the University of Tennessee undertook the development of a methodology that could be utilized in determining whether there were any differences in "rates" (see the revised Order No. 14 of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance) of promotion, tenure, and termination which could be linked to employee sex or race. It was decided that the analysis should control for such variables as tenure, rank, degree, and college. The tenure analysis also incorporated comparisons based on years of experience at this university while the promotion and termination studies based their comparisons on the number of years in present rank. After identifying the necessary data elements, a history file was developed composed of faculty from 1974-75 to 1978-79. Computer programs were designed to generate and test the significance of any differences.

Throughout the analyses, judgmental decisions had to be made such as whether to include or exclude faculty on leave-of-absence in the base year and/or comparison year, tenure versus non-tenure track, etc. As the study progressed, it became apparent that there were an almost infinite number of possible combinations of variables and/or comparison years. With the guidance and assistance of the university's administration, we were able to determine the particular comparisons that might prove most productive. The resulting analyses and interpretations should enable the university to respond to governmental guidelines and requirements with concrete and reliable information, and also to serve as a basis for monitoring these sensitive areas in the future.

COMPUTERIZED ENROLLMENT DRIVEN FINANCIAL FORECASTING MODEL

John R. Sarvella
Old Dominion University
Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
(804) 489-6566

An interactive, computerized model that utilizes university historical data, demographic characteristics, projected selected economic variables and population figures by various age groups and planning districts to forecast enrollment, FTEs and the financial condition of the institution.

The model, which consists of several modules, is designed to allow central management to personally interact with the computer by changing ratios or variables at run time and to receive immediate feedback as to their impact and sensitivity. Multiple iterations may be performed on any submodule and uniquely stored on-line for future retrieval with the ultimate objective of obtaining a bottom line dollar figure for the budget request.

From the standpoint of flexibility, design, and university adaptation, the model has been designed to give the user maximum flexibility in formating output, data manipulation, and mathematical computation. Output may be either displayed on a CRT, stored on disk, or printed on a line printer using page headings, comments, and numbers expressed as either integers or real numbers. Data manipulation may be achieved by the user, who specifies at run time from either the terminal or through control files, which data input files are to be used. In the area of mathematical computations, not only may the standard mathematical operation be performed, but also the user may call specific individually written functions or subroutines for unique application.

At the present time, the current model has several working modules which, for example, compute the University's state market share per planning district, headcount distributions by student level, FTEs by student level, FTEs by activity (on-campus, off-campus, and summer school), distribution per specialized or non-specialized program, and dollar amounts which have been derived through faculty allocation ratios. However, with the flexibility built into the model, many more individualized applications may be developed.

CONDUCTING DATA EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Allan M. Bloom
James R. Montgomery
Office of Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 961-6994

The exchange of comparable data among peer institutions can be an effective means of providing institutional research data in context, and it is a challenge to develop this tool as a more effective means of inter-institutional communication and cooperation. The literature on the subject, however, dwells generally on every facet of data exchange programs except their conduct, leaving a program developer to his/her devices. This paper addresses solely the conduct of a data exchange program, leaving such matters as data attributes and statistical analysis to the literature. The paper presents both principles and procedures that will lead to faster and smoother data exchange, easier and less expensive to carry out for participants. Examples from a successful project illustrate the development of a data exchange project, from initiation to fruition.

CONCERNS IN THE SELECTION OF AN APPROPRIATE DATA SOURCE: A CRITICAL ASPECT OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Ellen I. Posey

and

Donna L. Sylvan

Office of Institutional Planning
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 658-2570

A vital function of institutional research is the provision of timely, accurate information for administrative decision making. A critical aspect of this function is the ability to assess the actual question asked, to determine and process the necessary data, and to provide decision makers with information which they can utilize. This paper focuses on one step in this process: the determination of an appropriate data source. This emphasis is necessary because data which are not relevant to the problem provide no information.

An analysis of the research process shows the importance of data definition consensus among institutional researchers, administrators and data generators/collectors. Because the researcher is often forced to use existing data bases, he, as a secondary user, has no power over the initial design of the data base. However, the institutional researcher's global perspective of the institution's operation, informational needs, and research procedure justifies his participation in the conceptual and design stage of many operational systems. In order to impress the need for a total perspective, the researcher should assume an "advocacy role" with the administration advocating the need for a holistic approach to the establishment of policies regarding data definitions and an unfragmented and accessible data system. This role would also require the researcher to advocate a collective perspective of data source problems and solutions. All parties would benefit from collective efforts and collaboration in terms of efficient use of institutional resources and the accuracy and timeliness of response to administrative needs and requests.

R^2 ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH: SOME CONCERNS ON THE SELECTION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES IN REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Donna L. Sylvan

Office of Institutional Planning
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 658-2570

Multiple regression is a frequently used analytic tool. Yet despite its frequent use in institutional research, it cannot be assumed that the technique is always understood. R^2 is perhaps the most often cited statistic from a regression analysis, but it is not the only piece of information a user or consumer of such research should examine. The purpose of this paper is to explore problems related to the selection of the independent or predictor variables, a critical aspect of regression research which may be overlooked when R^2 alone is the criteron used to evaluate regression studies.

This paper focuses on the independent or predictor variables. Some issues involved in the initial selection of potential predictors are discussed, but the main emphasis is on the selection of predictors from among an identified set of potential independent variables. The suggested approach includes two basic steps: an examination of the simple correlations between the individual predictors and the dependent variable and an examination of the simple correlations among the individual predictors. The problem of multicollinearity, including its relationship to the interpretation of the findings, is addressed. Specific examples from institutional research studies of enrollment and class size are used.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS DESK REFERENCE

Maryann E. Steele

St. Edward's University
3001 South Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78704
(512) 444-2621 ext. 412

In the decades to come, the changing characteristics and decline in the number of freshmen will have repercussions affecting Offices of Institutional Research. No longer will colleges and universities be able to hire legions of statistical analysts to cope with the deluge of numbers that is generated daily. Planning Officers may take the place of Institutional Researchers. In general, administrators are being called upon more and more to make decisions on complex issues. The number of professional journals that have sprung up in recent years are full of data and ideas that administrators need to make their decisions. While knowledge of statistical analyses is not necessary, some understanding of methods of analysis would be helpful to these administrators for their decision-making process. The Statistical Analysis Desk Reference was designed to bring together the kinds of information that administrators need in understanding the research that is being done in higher education. Major methods of analysis are presented (ANOVA, Chi Square, Discriminant Analysis, etc.) through multiple word definitions compiled from standard statistical references. Although mathematical formulas may be included, they are not really necessary. Administrators reading studies are not concerned with the theoretical underpinnings of a particular method of statistical analysis, but with what the objectives of that model are and how that method differs from other methods. The salient feature of this desk reference is that it will enable the administrator to distinguish between the many types of statistical analysis without having to search through numerous statistical references, which may be very time consuming and frustrating, even to institutional researchers.

The attached Statistical Analysis Desk Reference is presented as a working model for other institutions to follow. The format is such that new information may easily be added. The concept is of a dynamic tool; not a static one. The Statistical Analysis Desk Reference should be on the desk of every administrator who has ever read a professional journal.

As an example of a practical application, this particular desk reference is being distributed to all members of the Planning Group of St. Edward's University.

EFFECTS ON PREDICTIVE ABILITY OF THE LINEAR VERSUS LOCATION MODELS IN DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Maryann E. Steele

St. Edward's University
3001 South Congress Ave.
Austin, Tx 78704
(512) 444-2621 ext. 412

Research in higher education is progressing from description to prediction. One method of prediction widely used in the social sciences is discriminant analysis (15 to 20 articles using this method have appeared in Research in Higher Education in the past six years). Green and Tull (1970) list the objectives of discriminant analysis as: a) to test for significant differences among the average "score" profiles of two or more a priori defined groups, assuming group covariation and dispersion are equal and the distributions are multinormal, b) to determine which variables account most for the intergroup differences in average profile, c) to find linear combinations of the predictor variables that enable the analyst to represent the groups by maximizing among-group relative to within-group separation, and d) to establish procedures for assigning new individuals whose profiles, but not group identity, are assumed to be from one of the a priori defined groups. It is with objective c that this paper is concerned. Linear analyses, such as the linear discriminant function, are proper only with continuous variables. In many cases in research in higher education, the data are not continuous, but in fact binary (i.e., sex). The question then is, If we are analyzing binary data with continuous variable techniques, how much predictive ability do we lose? Krzanowski (1975) concluded that with mixed variables (both binary and continuous) the best model for analysis is the location model with less than six or seven binary variables; the next best model being the location model with more than six or seven binary variables; and the weakest model (least correct predictive ability) being Fisher's linear discriminant function (for all continuous variables, but used with binary). This study will compare the two models, location and linear, in a discriminant analysis framework varying the number of binary variables. In the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences' section on Discriminant Analysis among the methods listed, Wilk's is a linear model and Mahalanobis is a location model. Data will consist of survey responses given by first-time entering freshmen, consisting of demographic and attitudinal data. Factor analysis will be performed on the attitudianl data to condense it into a manageable form. All demographic data that are at least ordinal-scaled will be used, along with varying numbers (7, 5 or 3) of binary demographic data.

According to Krzanowski, the best predictive ability should be for the Mahalanobis method with three binary variables, and the worst for the Wilk's method with seven binary variables. Institutional researchers have been analyzing binary data using linear models without regard to the assumptions for the linear model (normal distributions, equal group covariation, etc.) which may affect the predictive ability of the test.

TABLE TOPICS SESSION III

MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION PAPERS

ABOUT THAT DATA BASE THAT IS HIDING IN THE CLOSET--

Gerald H. Lunney
Director of Research
Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities
Box 668, Danville, Kentucky 40422 (606)236-3533

For many small institutions, Institutional Research, a part-time exercise, amounts to a process of scrambling around looking for the answers to questions on some external survey instrument. Once the form is completed and mailed it is forgotten as the person responsible for a particular survey gets back to his or her regular duties or to the next external survey that needs to be completed.

Institutional Research at these institutions is fractured, reactive and consists of repeated return to source data for information. There is little time, energy or effort expended on using data for planning. When the idea of planning data is mentioned, the institution responds, "We don't have time to develop a planning data base, we're too busy filling out the HEGIS report."

The paper that is proposed for the SAIR meeting is a response to this plaintive statement. What is proposed is a detailed analysis of the HEGIS survey to determine the adequacy of HEGIS as a planning data base for institutions which cannot afford the luxury of developing an independent data base.

The paper will look at the general forms and the specific data elements which are included in the HEGIS survey. It will attempt to identify areas where institutions need data which are not part of HEGIS as well as places where HEGIS asks for too much or too little detail. Finally, the paper will discuss ways that the data included in the HEGIS survey can be used as a planning data base.

It is hoped that the information included in the paper can be helpful to any institution concerned about planning data management.

THE FUTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AT LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By

W. Archie Blount
Director, Institutional Research

NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY
Greensboro
(919) 379-7797

INTRODUCTION

Man has faced many problem-situations dealing with Energy, Ecology, and Esthetics. The research capability of our nation's institutions has brought on an awareness of the critical nature of finding solutions to some of these situations. Our daily encounter with acute problem-solving situations is a demanding force for stronger institutional research.

PURPOSE

The purposes of this study are to first, attain a retrospective of institutional research at Land-Grant Colleges and Universities prior to 1979. And second, to ascertain indications as to what new directions institutional research might take during the 1980's at Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

SCOPE AND METHOD

The study is centered on the affairs of students, faculties, and the utilization of facilities. Data for the study were generated by use of a questionnaire to the directors of institutional research at Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

VALUE TO EDUCATORS

The findings of the study should aid educators in long-rage planning. Planning for the affairs of students, faculties, and the use of facilities in relationship to our imperative national well-being -- economically and socially. Further, developing strategies for dealing with energy, ecology, and esthetic crisis. Specifically according to institutional missions and goals.

A MULTIFACET APPROACH TO INSTITUTIONAL SURVIVAL

Thomas J. McAlpine
Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical University
P. O. Box 272, Normal, Alabama 35762
(205) 859 7272

Institutional Research (IR), traditionally associated with institutional studies, management analysis, and periodic management reports, that is if it was based in a large university or within substantial resources, has been challenged to focus on the academic functions which were omitted in the sixties (Wallhaus-AIR Newsletter, Summer, 1979). The nature of the challenge forces IR Offices with limited resources to become innovative and diverse in their functions. In addition to continuing in traditionally management related studies, IRs', out of necessity, must shoulder the responsibility of providing decision makers with data and information necessary for effective utilization of linkages to the larger community, program evaluation, and academic research. These are crucial if institutions are to remain viable and compttitive. This paper will employ the frameword set forth by demands for relevant data in program effectiveness institutional linkages to the larger community, and academic research to explore considerations and prospects of future Institutional Research involvements.

In response to declining enrollment, colleges and universities have employed marketing concepts and methodologies; yet, there appear to be little evidence of exploratory research in an effort to identify various formal institutional linkages through which information and interpretation of policy must flow. Top administrators have traditionally relied on recruiters, various unit directors, and the institution's clientele to assist in telling the institution's story. In an effort to facilitate the attainment of institution goals and objectives, IR at our university designed an exploratory inquiry to determine formal linkages, the respective respective data needs and research priorities; For Example, the prelimenary findings of the inquiry revealed that the Telecommunication Center's research priorities focused on institutional inagery. Institutional Research's future involvement in the linkage area provides continuity toward institutional viability and competitiveness, which, to a large degree, depend on change resulting from effective program evaluation.

Generally, IR has not been involved in the evaluation component of the institution. In my opinion, IR represents the logical unit to absorb this function, particularly where resource availibility does not permit seperate units. Activities in this function may range from feasibility studies to product evaluation. Currently, IR utilizes technical assistance function to assist faculty and unit directors in the design, monitoring, and interpretation of findings. One of the outcomes of this arrangement is continuity across data sources which serve as data suppliers in the planning process. An essential element in this planning process is relevant academic research data.

In an institution which does not possess an Educational Research Center, IR represents the unit that must provide technical expertise to assist educators in obtaining answers to the multitude of problems in the academic sector. The underlying assumption for the fulfillment of this and other functions in this multifacet approach is an IR Office staffed with experts capable or delivering the service and a structure which facilitate it.

EVALUATORS AS MANAGERS

Sue M. Legg, Assistant Director, Testing and Evaluation
Gail Miles, Coordinator of Tutors
Office of Instructional Resources, 1012 GPA
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611
(904) 392-0371

The effectiveness of institutional researchers as evaluators depends upon their ability to generate data useful for making policy decisions. Yet, the tools with which we measure the quality of instruction are imprecise and of limited value for policy makers. If evaluations are designed as part of a management system, then the data are not only relevant for administrators, they also help to structure the instructional process so that it can succeed. This paper is a description of an evaluation process designed for the management of non-traditional programs in mathematics, reading and English composition at the university level.

The foundation of the system is the development of a procedures manual. The process of developing the manual generates questions about policies which affect the administration, the students, and the operation and effectiveness of the staff and the program. In the second phase of the evaluation the questions which can be answered by data analysis are listed, and a variety of small scale studies are drafted. Examples of questions are:

Are the size of the staff and the space adequate?
Can the program be structured to inhibit procrastination and prevent cheating?
Should attendance be required; should students be able to drop?
How should grades be assigned; do students succeed in higher levels?
What does the program cost; how should cost be calculated?

The third component of the evaluation system, the data collection process, provides a continuous record of student progress, and weekly cumulative reports are printed for every student. Each quarter grade distributions and cumulative records are used to evaluate grading and testing policies. Tutor evaluations are conducted quarterly not only for the personal development of tutors, but also for the revision of the tutor training program.

All of the above information is used in the fourth step of the evaluation process, the quarterly review of the procedures manual. The manual becomes the reference point for all staff and tends to keep the practice in line with the stated goals of the program.

The final phase of the evaluation is the generation of reports for dissemination to the staff, administrative units and agencies outside the university. These reports range from one page summaries to full scale reports which document the changes in procedures and summarize student achievement.

The management approach to instructional evaluation evolved because it was obvious from the inception of these programs that their success depended as much upon program management as upon the quality of instruction and materials. Since good management depends upon data which are easily accessible, this system becomes part of the management process. Essentially, this paper describes the implementation of evaluation at the operational level, gives an explanation of how and why it works, and explains how institutional researchers can adapt the system to their needs.

WOMEN'S ATHLETICS AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Linda B. Williamson
Research Analyst, Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 961-6994

Beatrice T. Mahan
Assistant Director, Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 961-6994

The participation of women in college sports has more than doubled in the past decade, with women now constituting 26 percent of all college athletes (Underwood, 1979). This rapid growth of women's athletics and the recent emphasis on Title IX guidelines regarding athletic programs at federally assisted educational institutions (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978) have colleges and universities across the country reviewing their women's athletic programs.

The Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) states current policy and guidelines for women's athletics (AIAW Handbook, 1978), but it does not help determine the type and level of support an institution should develop. This paper reports on the results of several studies which we conducted to help determine:

1. What are the best sports to add to women's intercollegiate athletics at our institution?

2. What are current practices in staffing for women's athletic programs?

3. What changes are anticipated in women's athletic programs at institutions in our geographic vicinity?

One study surveyed the opinions of a sample of undergraduate students. Which sports would men and women prefer to watch? In which sports were women most likely to participate? The second study was a questionnaire sent to the women's athletic directors of 19 institutions in Virginia and bordering states. Information was gathered on the organization and administration of women's athletic programs, number of coaches for women's sports, type of sports activities, and financial data.

Implications

With Title IX an important issue with respect to athletics in higher education, Institutional Research can assist institutions in determining the desirability of various alternatives. A review of these two studies and their results will benefit others who are faced with similar concerns.

ORDERING INFORMATION

SAIR TABLE TOPIC PAPERS

Most of the papers presented at the 1979 SAIR conference in Orlando will be available in their entirety through the ERIC microfiche collections located in colleges and universities in the United States and other countries. Papers will be announced in the May and June 1980 issues of Resources in Education in the Author Index under the author's name. Each paper will have an "ED" number and price code which will be required when ordering. (Microfiche and hard copies of individual papers can be ordered using the order form illustrated below, which is found in the back of Resources in Education.)

HOW TO ORDER ERIC DOCUMENTS

ERIC

OPERATED BY

DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE
P.O. Box 190 ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22210 • (703) 841-1212
COMPUTER MICROFILM INTERNATIONAL CORP.

ORDER FORM

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

- ORDER BY ED NO. (6 digits) See Resources in Education (RIE)
- SPECIFY EITHER: Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- ENTER UNIT PRICE (See Below)
- INCLUDE SHIPPING CHARGES (See Charts Below)
- ENCLOSE CHECK OR MONEY ORDER Payable to EDRS in U.S. Funds. Check must indicate the U.S. transit number of your banks agency
- OR ENCLOSE AUTHORIZED ORIGINAL PURCHASE ORDER
- COMPLETE AND SIGN BELOW

SHIP TO: _____

BILL TO: _____

Name _____

Signature _____

Title _____

ED NUMBER	NO. OF PAGES	NO. OF COPIES MF	NO. OF COPIES PC	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES				SUBTOTAL	
TAX EXEMPT NO. _____				VA RESIDENTS ADD 4% SALES TAX	
				SHIPPING	
DEPOSIT ACCT. NO. _____				TOTAL	

UNIT PRICE SCHEDULE

MICROFICHE (MF)

NUMBER FICHE EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 5 (up to 480 pages)	MF01	$ .83
6 (481-576 pages)	MF02	1.00
7 (577-672 pages)	MF03	1.17
8 (673-768 pages)	MF04	1.34
Each additional microfiche (additional 96 pages)		.17

PAPER COPY (PC)

NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 25	PC01	$1.86
26 to 50	PC02	3.32
51 to 75	PC03	4.80
76 to 100	PC04	6.32
Each additional 25 pages		1.50

CHARTS FOR DETERMINING SHIPPING CHARGES

1st CLASS POSTAGE FOR

1-3 Microfiche ONLY	4-8 Microfiche ONLY	9-14 Microfiche ONLY	15-18 Microfiche ONLY	19-21 Microfiche ONLY	22-27 Microfiche ONLY	28-32 Microfiche ONLY
$.15	$.29	$.41	$.54	$.80	$.93	$1.06

U.P.S. CHARGES FOR

1 lb 30-75 MF or 1-75 PC PAGES Not to Exceed	2 lbs 76-150 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	3lbs 151-225 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	4 lbs 226-300 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	5 lbs 301-375 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	6 lbs 376-450 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	7 lbs 451-525 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed	8 to 20 lbs 526-1500 MF or PC PAGES Not to Exceed
$1.14	$1.45	$1.76	$2.08	$2.39	$2.70	$3.02	$3.33-$7.08

NOTE—Orders for 30 or more microfiche and all orders for paper copies (PC) will be shipped via United Parcel Service unless otherwise instructed.

Revised June 1979

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE.
THIS FORM MAY BE PHOTOCOPIED OR ADDITIONAL COPIES OBTAINED FROM EDRS.

MINUTES

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

of the

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

October 26, 1979
Orlando, Florida

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. The minutes for the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

Announcements followed. F. Craig Johnson reviewed activities of the AIR executive committee and requested comments or suggestions from the SAIR membership. Gregory Litaker presented information on the site of the 1980 SAIR conference (Louisville, Kentucky) and James Montgomery made several general announcements for the good of the order. SAIR President Norman Uhl announced the election of Larry Jones as the next SAIR Vice President. Officers for the coming year are:

President . . . . . Suzanne Larsen, University of Tennessee
Vice President. . . Larry Jones, University of Georgia
Secretary/Treasurer E. Michael Staman, Christopher Newport College

The treasurer's report was approved as distributed, and Norman Uhl read the Report of the Audit Committee. Other committee reports followed. Richard Howard presented a progress report of planned SAIR activities for the Atlanta forum.

The following five names were presented for consideration as members of the Nominating Committee: Peggy L. Moore, Old Dominion University; Murriel L. Gilliam, Oklahoma State University; Annie Mai Miller, Lane College; Gerald Lunney, Council of Indiana Kentucky Colleges & Universities; Kevin Hunt, Tidewater Community College. Two persons chosen from these five by the president will serve with the immediate past president as the Nominating Committee.

Gerry McLaughlin reviewed each of the fourteen proposed changes to the constitution. A motion to accept all fourteen changes passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Respectively submitted,

E. Michael Staman
Secretary/Treasurer

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS*

OF THE

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Article I — Name

The name of the organization shall be the Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR).

Article II — Purposes

The major purposes of this Association shall be to provide: 1) for the dissemination of information and the interchange of ideas on problems of common interest; 2) for the continued professional development of individuals engaging in institutional research; 3) for the fostering of unity and cooperation among persons having interests and activities related to institutional research; 4) for the advancement of post-secondary education.

Article III — Membership and Voting

Section 1. Membership in the Association and election to any office or appointment to any committee shall not be based on race, ethnic origin, sex, age, or religious conviction.

Section 2. Membership shall be open to any person actively engaged in institutional research, or who has professional interest in activities related to institutional research.

Section 3. Membership shall include all individuals who pay a registration fee for the SAIR annual meeting and those who do not attend the annual meeting, but pay a membership fee. Membership is valid until the start of the next SAIR annual meeting.

Section 4. Except for the election of officers, voting shall take place at the annual business meeting and be restricted to those members in attendance. For the election of officers, a ballot will be included in the announcement of the annual meeting sent to members of this association.

Article IV — Officers

Section 1. The officers of the Association shall consist of a President, a Vice President, and a Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. President - The President shall: a) have general responsibility for promoting membership in the Association; b) appoint committee members; c) serve as chairperson for the annual Conference; d) work with committees in formulating policy and expediting the implementation of such policies; e) consult with the Vice-President in planning the annual Conference; and f) perform any other duties necessary to assist the Association in achieving its purposes as stated in the Constitution.

* Reflects all changes adopted at the annual business meeting October 26, 1979.

Section 3. Vice-President - The Vice-President shall: a) plan the program for the next year's annual Conference; b) assist the President in other duties as the need arises; and c) assume the duties of the President in the event that person cannot complete his/her term.

Section 4. Secretary-Treasurer - The Secretary-Treasurer shall: a) maintain and publish an annual listing of the membership of the Association; b) keep the minutes of the annual business meeting and of the meetings of the Executive Committee; c) collect annual Conference registration and membership fees; d) provide for the payment of duly authorized expenses of the Association; e) prepare informal financial statements for the Executive Committee and complete financial reports for the annual business meeting; f) print and distribute notices and proceedings of the annual Conference; and g) perform any other duties assigned by the President or Vice-President.

Section 5. Term of Officers - The Vice-President shall be elected for a two-year term and will be President for the second year. The term of office of the Secretary-Treasurer shall be three years. All newly elected officers shall assume office at the close of the annual Conference following the announcement of their election.

Section 6. Vacancies - Unless otherwise provided for the Constitution, the Executive Committee shall have the authority to fill a vacancy by appointing an Association member to fill unexpired terms. A person appointed to finish the term of Vice-President must run for election to become President. In this situation both the office of President and Vice-President will appear on the ballot. If the elected President resigns, the Vice-President completes the year as President and is also the President the following year. In all other situations the person appointed to an unexpired term shall be eligible to succeed him/herself and to serve a full elective term as provided in the Constitution.

Section 7. Succession - Officers cannot succeed themselves in the same office except as noted in Sections 5 and 6.

Section 8. Election of Officers - All officers shall be elected by a ballot distributed to the membership with the announcement of the annual meeting. The ballot shall be returned to the secretary-treasurer for tabulation. The results will be announced at the annual business meeting.

Article V Executive Committee

Section 1. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, immediate Past-President, and two members at large. The current President shall chair the Committee.

Section 2. The Executive Committee shall: a) conduct the general affairs of the Association between its annual meetings; b) set the time and location of the next year's meeting; c) function as the Budget Committee; and d) fill vacancies, unless otherwise provided for the Constitution.

Section 3. One Member at Large will be elected each year and will serve for a two-year term. They shall assist the Executive Committee in performing duties necessary to assist the Association in achieving its purposes as stated in the Constitution.

Article VI Bylaws

The Association shall adopt bylaws consistent with this Constitution as required for the conduct of its affairs.

Section 1. Proposed changes in the bylaws: a) may be submitted in writing to any member of the Executive Committee at least sixty (60) days prior to the annual meeting, or; b) may be proposed through action originating in the Executive Committee.

Section 2. The Secretary Treasurer shall be responsible for printing any proposed bylaws or amendment(s) initiated in accordance with Section 1 of this Article, and for submitting them to the registered members for consideration at the annual business meeting.

Section 3. A proposed change in the bylaws shall become effective at the end of the annual business meeting at which it was approved by a majority of the registered members present.

Article VII Amendments

This Constitution may be amended at the annual business meeting.

Section 1. Proposed amendments to this Constitution: a) may be submitted to any member of the Executive Committee by a member of this Association in writing at least sixty (60) days prior to the annual meeting, or; b) may originate through actions in the Executive Committee.

Section 2. Proposed amendments must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Executive Committee.

Section 3. Amendments approved by the Executive Committee shall be circulated at least (30) days prior to the annual business meeting and at the annual business meeting by the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 4. Proposed changes to this Constitution conforming with Sections 1-3 of this Article shall become effective at the end of the annual business meeting at which they are approved by two-thirds of the registered members present.

Bylaws

Section 1. Conference

The annual Conference of the Association shall be held during October of each year at a site and date determined by the Executive Committee and approved at the annual business meeting by the registrants in attendance. The Secretary-Treasurer shall be responsible for notifying all members of the date and location of the annual Conference at least sixty days prior to the Conference. The annual business meeting shall be held in conjunction with the annual Conference. The Vice-President of the Association will be in charge of the program for this conference.

Section 2. Calendar

The fiscal year of the Association shall begin September 1.

Section 3. Fees

A. A registration fee will be assessed to all who register for the annual Conference each year. Those who pay this fee will be members until the next SAIR Conference.

B. A membership fee shall be determined by the Executive Committee and will be assessed to all who do not pay the registration fee but wish to receive the benefit of the following SAIR services to include: Conference proceedings, membership list, advance notice of proposals for changes to the Constitution.

C. A discount in fees shall be established for full-time graduate students by the Executive Committee.

D. Fees shall be reviewed and set annually in July by the Executive Committee.

Section 4 Committees

A. A Nominating Committee composed of the immediate past President and at least two other members from a group of five proposed at the annual meeting by the voting members shall be appointed by the President no later than July 1 before each annual Conference.

B. An Audit Committee shall be appointed by the President for each annual business meeting. The Committee shall audit the Treasurer's books for the preceding fiscal year.

C. A Local Arrangements Committee shall be appointed by the Vice President in consultation with the President for each annual Conference.

D. Such other committees as deemed necessary for the welfare of the Association may be appointed by the President.

Section 5. Quorum

A quorum to conduct the business of the Association shall consist of twenty-five (25) percent of the registrants of the annual Conference.

APPENDIX B: ROSTER OF MEMBERS

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

STEVE AHRENS, Assistant Director
Institutional Research
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

DON ANDERSON, Director
Institutional Research
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

LOYD D. ANDREW, Assoc. Professor
College of Education
256 U.C.O.B.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

ROBERT T. ANDREWS, Director
Institutional Research
Oakwood College
Huntsville, Alabama 35806

JAMES R. ANDREWS, Executive Director
for Administration
Henderson State University
Arkadelphia, Arkansas 71923

ROSA TAYLOR BANKS, Executive Asst.
to the President
Oakwood College
Huntsville, Alabama 35806

RICHARD H. BARNARD, Director of
Institutional Research
West Virginia College of Graduate
Study
Institute, West Virginia 25112

STEVE W. BATSON, Administrative
Specialist, Institutional Research
Office of Vice President for Academic
Affairs
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro, Georgia 30458

JERRY J. BAUDIN, Director
Institutional Research
117 D. Boyd Hall
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

JOSEPH BEDITZ, Graduate Student
334-8 Pennell Circle
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

DAVID P. BELL, Coordinator
Academic Planning, Vice President for
Academic Affairs
University of Houston System
4800 Calhoun
Houston, Texas 77004

WANDA BEMBRY, Secretary
Research, Planning & MIS
Fort Valley State College
P. O. Box 5326
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

KATHLEEN BENJAMIN, Coordinator
Institutional Research
Shelby State Community College
1588 Union Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38104

LAWRENCE S. BESTMAN, Director
Institutional Research
Florida Medical College
15800 N.W. 42nd Asenue
Miami, Florida 33054

WESLEY E. BLAMICK, Director
Research and Evaluation
The School Board of Orange County
P. O. Box 271, 434 N. Tampa Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32802

ALLAN M. BLOOM, Assistant Director
Institutional Research
315 Burruss Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

W. ARCHIE BLOUNT, Director
Institutional Research
North Carolina Agric. and Technical
State University
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

DAVID C. BODENMAN, Assistant Director
Office of Institutional Studies
Main Building 202
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

GEORGIANNA D. BOLDEN, Director
Analytic Studies
Atlanta University
P. O. Box 253 223 Chestnut St.,S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

RICHARD E. BORING, Management and Analyst, President's Office
53 Turner House
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

EDWARD M. BROWN, Research Associate
Office of Institutional Research
111 Student Services Bldg.
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

CHARLES I. BROWN, Assoc. Professor Education
Fayetteville State University
Box 951
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

MARILYN K. BROWN, Director
Data Research Center
Turner Lab.
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

CECILIA MCDANIEL BROWN, Executive Assistant to Chancellor
University of South Carolina at Spartanburg
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303

WILLIS L. BROWN
Institutional Research and Planning
Langston University
P. O. Box 907
Langston, Oklahoma 73050

JEANNE BUDIG, Director
Planning and Research
Lincoln University of Missouri
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

DELORES P. BUFORD, Research Associate
Institutional Planning
Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina 29613

W. RICHARD BURLESON, Director
Institutional Research
University of New Orleans
Lake Front
New Orleans, Louisiana 70123

ROBERT D. CAREY, Executive Vice President responsible for Institutional Analysis
Union College
Barbourville, Kentucky 40906

P. ALLEN CARLSON, Director
Institutional Research
Virginia Military Institute
Lexington, Virginia 24450

PAUL CARNEY, Research Associate
Budget and Analysis
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

EDITH CARTER, Statistician
New River Community College
P. O. Box 1127
Dublin, Virginia 24084

FLETCHER CARTER, Director
Institutional Research
Radford University
P. O. Box 5781
Radford, Virginia 24142

SHIRLEY M. CHAPMAN, Director
Institutional Research
Voorhees College
Denmark, South Carolina 29042

WANDA E. CHEEK, Coordinator of Information Assimilation
Board of Regents, Univ. System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

MELODIE E. CHRISTAL, Psychometrist
Institutional Research
Mississippi State University
Drawer EY
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

GEORGE A. CLOVIS, Dean
Administrative Services
Parkersburg Comm. College
Route 5, Box 167-A
Parkersburg, West Virginia 26101

DANIEL R. COLEMAN, Director
Institutional Research and Planning
University of Central Florida
Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816

SAMUEL C. COX, Assistant Director
Management Systems Office
Seminole Community College
Sanford, Florida 32771

SANDY DAVIS, Director
Institutional Research
North Carolina Central Univ.
1805 Fayetteville Street
Durham, North Carolina 27707

DEBRA ANN DAVIS, Research Assistant
Atlanta University
P. O. Box 253, 223 Chestnut St.,S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

DWIGHT DAVIS
Institutional Research Officer
Lincoln University
Lincoln, Pennsylvania 19352

MELVIN DAVIS
Institutional Research
Alabama A & M University
P. O. Box 272
Normal, Alabama 35762

JOHN B. DUBRIEL, Acting Director
Research, Planning & MIS
Fort Valley State College
P. O. Box 4531
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

JULIA DUCKWELL, Graduate Student
Florida State University
2312 B. Columbia Court
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

ALFREDO ESTRANO
339-6 Pennell Circle
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

WILLIAM R. FENDLEY, JR., Asst. Dir.
Institutional Analysis
University of Virginia
102 Levering Hall, East Range
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

JOANNE C. FERRIOT, Asst. Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs
University of New Orleans
Lake Front
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

WILLIAM A. FINGAL, Director
Planning, Management & Accountability
Mississippi Valley State Univ.
P. O. Box 62
Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941

JAMES W. FIRNBERG, Coordinator
System Office of Institutional Research
Louisiana State University System
P. O. Box 20470-A
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70893

JEAN FITZGERALD, Assistant to the President
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia 26201

HUGH R. FORDYCE, Director
Institutional Research
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

DALLAS R. FOX, Associate Director
University Planning
University of Florida
355 Tigert Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611

OLEN GARY, Director
Institutional Research
Nicholls State University
Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301

PATRICIA E. GAYNOR, Associate Professor
Economics
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28607

JERRY L. GEHRE, Assistant Director
Internal Research, Systems & Planning
East Tennessee State University
Campus Box 23980A
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

LINDA L. GILBERT, System Coordinator
Budget and Analysis
Florida State University
424 Westcott
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

M. L. GILLIAM, Assistant Director
Institutional Research
Oklahoma State University
301 Whitehurst Hall
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

D. F. GLOVER, Director
Institutional Research
Morris Brown College
643 M. L. King Dr., N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

GARY W. GRAFF, Coordinator
College Planning and Research
West Virginia State College
P. O. Box 368
Institute, West Virginia 25112

MARY GARDINER GRUENWALD, Director
Institutional Research
Administration Bldg. 171
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

JANET L. HAILEY, Computer Research Specialist
Planning & Analysis,
Room 355 Tigert Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

JOHN T. HEMMETER, Director
Institutional Research
111 Student Services Bldg.
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

JAMES A. HENDERSON, Director of Planning and Research
Midlands Technical College
P. O. Drawer Q
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

JOYCE HICKSON, Research Associate
Institutional Research
Mississippi State University
Drawer EY
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

JAMES M. HOEY, Coordinator
Computer Center
Potomac State College of West Virginia University
Keyser, West Virginia 26726

JEFFREY HOLMES, Director
Education, Science and Culture Div., Statistics
224 Cooper Street, Apt. 2
Ottawa, Canada K2P 0G4

DAVID HOPP, Director
Institutional Research
Virginia Commonwealth University
Box 116 MCV
Richmond, Virginia 23298

RICHARD D. HOWARD, Director
Institutional Research
209 Purinton House
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

LLOYD R. HOWELL
University Planning Analyst
Old Dominion University
Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

W. KEVIN HUNT, Director
Research, Planning and Data
Tidewater Community College
Route 135
Portsmouth, Virginia 23703

ELLEN M. IRONSIDE, Research Assistant
02 South Building 005A
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

ELIZABETH D. IVEY, Director
Institutional Research
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, Tennessee 37040

RUBY M. JACKSON, Director
Institutional Research
Southern University in New Orleans
6400 Press Drive
New Orleans, Louisiana 70126

EUGENE S. JOHNSON, Director
Institutional Research
Lemoyne-Owen College
807 Walker Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38126

F. CRAIG JOHNSON, Professor
217A Education Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

ROBERT A. JOHNSON, Director
Institutional Research
Alcorn State University
Lorman, Mississippi 39096

LARRY G. JONES, Associate Director
Institutional Research and Planning
310 New College
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

JACK D. JONES, Coordinator
Advanced Institutional Development Program
Gainesville Junior College
Gainesville, Georgia 30503

MARVIN A. JONES, Director
Student Services Dev.
Virginia State University
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

DIANA JOSEPH, Administrative Assistant
Institutional Research
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

CAROL KAYLA, Institutional
Research Analyst
209 Purinton House
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

ANWAR KHAN, Coordinator
Institutional Research
111 Young Hall
Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

EMMETT T. KOHLER, Director
Institutional Research
Mississippi State University
Drawer EY
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

GEORGE I. KUEHN, Director
Institutional Research
St. Leo College
Postal Drawer K
St. Leo, Florida 33525

JON R. LAMAN, Research Specialist
Institutional Research
228 Administration Building
University of Tennessee, Martin
Martin, Tennessee 38238

SUZANNE W. LARSEN, Associate Director
Office of Institutional Research
111 Student Services Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

WILLIAM F. LASHER, Director of
Institutional Studies
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

LILLIAN Y. LEHMAN, Registrar and
Director, Institutional Research
02 South Building 005A
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

STEPHAN A. LEWIS, Coordinator of
Institutional Research
Board of Regents, University System
of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

ROBERT I. LEWIS, II, Director
Institutional Standards and Planning,
Management and Evaluation
Norfolk State College
2401 Corprew Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23504

RAYMOND L. LEWISKI
Personnel Research Psychologist,
Institutional Research
Community College of the Air Force
Maxwell Air Force Base
Montgomery, Alabama 36112

R. GREGORY LITAKER, Institutional
Research Officer
Office of Institutional Research
Administrative Annex, Belknap Campus
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

PHILIP LITTLE, Accountant
Budgets and Systems
206 Sikes Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

LOIS LOCKYER, Institutional Research Analyst
Institutional Research and Planning
310 New College
The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

GERALD H. LUNNEY, Director
of Research
Council of Independent Colleges and
Universities
Box 668
Danville, Kentucky 40422

BEA T. MAHAN, Assistant Director
Institutional Research
315 Burruss Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

RICHARD A. MANAHAN, Vice President
Business Affairs
Radford University
P. O. Box 5550
Radford, Virginia 24142

ROBERT L. MARSHALL, Director
Institutional Research
504 College Drive
Albany State College
Albany, Georgia 31705

GREALY MARSHALL, Research Analyst
Institutional Research and Planning
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama 35160

MARY P. MARTIN, Graduate Student, Institutional Research
Florida State University
924 W. Pensacola A 26
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

NATHAN MASAURE
North Carolina Central University
1805 Fayetteville Street
Durham, North Carolina 27707

JOANNE MAURA, Director
Institutional Research and Planning
College of Notre Dame
4701 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

THOMAS J. MCALPINE, Director
Institutional Research
Alabama A & M University
P. O. Box 272
Normal, Alabama 35762

JOAN MCCAULEY, Assistant Director
Policy & Operations Analysis
Room 7 Administration Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40502

GERALD W. MCLAUGHLIN, Associate Director of Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

G. L. MEARS, Director
Institutional Studies
University of Arkansas
33rd and University
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

MANTHA VLAHOS MEHALLIS, Director
Institutional Research Systems and Planning
Broward Community College
225 East Las Olas Blvd.
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301

GAIL MILES, Tutor Coordinator
Office of Institutional Research
318-3 University Village
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32603

ANNIE MAI MILLER, Director
Institutional Research
Lane College
Jackson, Tennessee 38301

PAT MILLER
Research Analysis
Administration Annex Building
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

JAMES R. MONTGOMERY, Director
Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

MARGARET L. MOORE
University Planning Analyst
Old Dominion University
Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

JAMES O. NICHOLS, Director
Institutional Research
205 Lyceum Building
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi 38677

RYNELL S. NOVAK
Research Division
Baptist Home Mission Board
1350 Spring Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

MARY ALICE ORAHOOD, Assistant Director
Institutional Studies
University of Arkansas
33rd and University
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

WILLIAM H. OSBORNE, Director of Research
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas 72032

LAKE C. OXFORD, Assistant Academic Vice President and Director, Institutional Res.
Northeast Louisiana University
700 University Avenue
Monroe, Louisiana 71209

RUSSELL C. PEOPLES, Director
Research and Federal Programs
Edison Community College
College Parkway
Fort Myers, Florida 33907

RONALD J. PERROTE, Director
Institutional Research
Huston-Tillotson College
1820 E. 8th Street
Austin, Texas 78702

REUBEN PETTIFORD, Director of
Institutional Research, AIDP
Texas College
2404 North Grand Avenue
Tyler, Texas 75702

JULIATTE W. PHILLIP
Oakwood College
Oakwood Road Box 139
Huntsville, Alabama 35806

ARTHUR J. PINDLE, Director
Institutional Research
Fayetteville State University
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

HASKINS POUNDS, Vice Chancellor for Planning
University System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

RANDALL POWELL, Director
Institutional Research
L. U. Station 18
Livingston University
Livingston, Alabama 35470

LINDA K. PRATT, Associate Director for Research and Evaluation
North Carolina Central University
122 Radcliff
Durham, North Carolina 27713

JANE PRESTON, Research Assistant
Institutional Research
Lincoln University
111 Young Hall
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

MERRILL PRITCHETT, Director
Institutional Research
Title III
University of Arkansas at Monticello
Monticello, Arkansas 71655

RONALD L. REGISTER, Coordinator
Institutional Research
University of South Florida
4202 Fowler Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33620

DONALD J. REICHARD, Director
Institutional Research
304 Mossman Adm. Building
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

SUSAN H. REID, Institutional Research Officer, Planning and Development
Austin Community College
P. O. Box 2165
Austin, Texas 78768

JOHN REMINGTON, Director
Center for Labor Research
Florida International University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, Florida 33199

J. DAVID REYNARD, Director
Institutional Research and Planning
Delaware State College
Dupont Highway
Dover, Delaware 19901

ROBERT A. ROSS, Coordinator
Institutional Research
Piedmont Virginia Community College
Route 6, Box 1A
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

LINDA C. RUBIN, Research/Program Development
F.M.H.I.
Tampa, Florida 33606

ED RUGG, Associate Director
Institutional Research and Planning
205 Lyceum Building
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi 38677

JERRY H. RUST, JR., Director
Internal Research, Systems and Planning
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

C. DUDLEY SALLEY, Research Associate
Institutional Planning
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

TIMOTHY R. SANFORD, Associate Director
Institutional Research
02 South Building, 005A
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

JOHN R. SARVELLA, Planning Analyst
University Planning and Analysis
Old Dominion University
Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

E. F. SCHIETINGER, Director of Research
Southern Regional Education Board
130 6th Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

JOHN SCHOFIELD, Director
Institutional Research
Pitt Community College
P. O. Drawer 7007
Highway 11, South
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

ELIZABETH SIBOLSKI, Senior Planning Analyst, Office of Budget and Plng.
The American University
Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20016

JEFF E. SMITH, Director
Institute on Desegregation
North Carolina Central University
1801 Fayetteville Street
Durham, North Carolina 27707

EDWIN R. SMITH, Assistant Vice President, Administration
104 Stewart Hall
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

GLYNTON SMITH, Coordinator of Institutional Research
Office of Institutional Planning
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

J. STEPHEN SMITH, Assistant Vice President for Health Affairs
102-C Mortimer Jordan Hall
University of Alabama in Birmingham
University Station
Birmingham, Alabama 35294

MARGARET SMITH, Research Analysis
Administration Annex Building
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

PRITCHY SMITH, Coordinator
Institutional Research
Jarvis Christian College
Hawkins, Texas 75765

E. MICHAEL STAMAN, Assistant to the President and Director of Planning
Christopher Newport College
P. O. Box 6070
Newport News, Virginia 23606

KAY STAUB, Director
Institutional Research
The University of Alabama
P. O. Box 6255
University, Alabama 35486

Maryann E. Steele, Research Associate
Office of Planning & Institutional Research
St. Edward's University
3001 S. Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78704

SANDRA J. STORRAR, Director
Academic Asstance & Scheduling
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

DENISE STRENGLEIN, Coordinator
Institutional Research
University of South Florida
ADM 280
Tampa, Florida 33620

DEBORAH C. STRICKLAND, Student
103-I Terrace View Apartments
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

DONNA L. SYLVAN, Research Analyst
Office of Institutional Research
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

JOHN G. TAYLOR, Jr., Manager
Office of Statistics & Reports
Box 4380
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

GAYLA B. THOMAS, P.M.E. Analyst
Tennessee State University
3500 Centennial Boulevard
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

JOHN THORNELL, Director
Institutional Research
Kethley 200
Cleveland, Mississippi 38733

BETTY TILTON, Assistant Director Institutional Research, Budget and Analysis
Room 424 Westcott
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

MERCEDES W. TOLAN, Research Analyst
Research, Planning, and MIS
Fort Valley State College
P. O. Box 5635
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

FLOYD P. TREADWAY, PME Director
Jacksonville State University
P. O. Box 218
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265

NORMAN UHL, Associate Vice Chancellor
Research, Evaluation and Planning
North Carolina Central University
1805 Fayetteville Street
Durham, North Carolina 27707

SANDY UNDERWOOD, Research Analyst
Budgets and Systems
206 Sikes Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

ROBERT M. USSERY, Director
Institutional Research
Rawl Annex
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

PHILLIP N. WASHINGTON, Director
Institutional Research
P. O. Box 5196 Tech Station
Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, Louisiana 71272

ROY WEAVER, Research Assistant
Institutional Research
Shelby State Community College
1588 Union Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38104

TOM WELSH, Statistician I. A.
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

LINDA B. WILLIAMSON, Research Analyst
Office of Institutional Research
315 Burruss Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

REBECCA L. WILSON, Research Assistant
Institutional Studies and Services
University of Alabama in Birmingham
University Station
Birmingham, Alabama 35294

FRED H. WISE, Director
Management Information
Planning and Analysis
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

CHARLES H. WITTEN, Associate Professor
Higher Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

JAMES R. WOODS, Dean of
Administrative Services
Volunteer State Community College
Nashville Pike
Gallatin, Tennessee 37066

WAYNE M. WORMLEY, Director of
Institutional Research and Planning
Fisk University
17th Avenue North
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

JANE P. WOSTEN, Coordinator
Institutional Research
Volunteer State Community College
Nashville Pike
Gallatin, Tennessee 37066

CHARLES M. YAGER, Director of Dev.
Extension and Public Service
College Circle
North Georgia College
Dahlonega, Georgia 30533

APPENDIX C: PROGRAM

October 25, 1979 ******** THURSDAY ******** October 25, 1979	
10:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	CONFERENCE REGISTRATION
12:30 p.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	WELCOME: Trevor Colbourn, President University of Central Florida
12:45 p.m.	KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Marvin A. Peterson, Director and Professor, Center for Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan; Editor, New Directions in Institutional Research
1:30 - 2:30 p.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	PANEL: Past, Present and Future of Institutional Research. Moderator: Edwin R. Smith, Assistant Vice President, Administration, West Virginia University Panelists: James W. Firnberg, Coordinator, I.R., Louisiana State University System James R. Montgomery, Director, I.R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Norman P. Uhl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Research, Evaluation and Planning, North Carolina Central University
2:30 - 2:45 p.m.	BREAK
2:45 - 3:45 p.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	PANEL: Integrated Approach to Marketing at a Land Grant Institution. Moderator: Emmett T. Kohler, Director of I.R., Mississippi State University Panelists: Melodie E. Christal, Psychometrist, Mississippi State University Joyce Hickson, Research Associate, Mississippi State University Roy H. Ruby, Assistant to Vice President for Student Affairs, Mississippi State University
3:50 - 5:00 p.m. Ivanhoe Room	TABLE TOPICS SESSION I Student and Enrollment Papers
3:50 - 5:00 p.m. Concord Room	TABLE TOPICS SESSION II Methodology Papers
3:50 - 5:00 p.m. Concord Room	TABLE TOPICS SESSION III Management and Evaluation Papers

8:30 - 9:30 a.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	SAIR BUSINESS MEETING: Norman Uhl, SAIR President North Carolina Central University
9:30 - 10:30 a.m.	PANEL: The Budgeting Process in a Steady State Economy. Moderator: Fletcher F. Carter, Director, I.R., Radford University Panelists: Edith Carter, Acting Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Richard A. Manahan, Vice President for Business and Finance, Radford College Robert P. Schultze, Assistant Director, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia Keith L. Scott, Vice President, Administration, University of South Florida
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	BREAK
10:45 - 11:45 a.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	PRESENTATION FROM MARKETING DIVISION, SEA WORLD
11:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m. Mid-Florida Ballroom A	CLOSING REMARKS AND EVALUATION

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Denise Strenglein (chair)
Fletcher F. Carter
Barbara D. Holmes
D. Robert Moxley

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Robert I. Lewis, II
Fred H. Wise

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

Gerald W. McLaughlin, (chair)
Charles I. Brown
George A. Clovis
Robert I. Lewis, II
Mary Alice Orahood
Glynton Smith

PROGRAM COMMITTEE, SAIR SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP, 1979 AIR FORUM

Richard D. Howard (chair)
Charles I. Brown
Fletcher F. Carter
Mantha Vlahos Mehallis
James O. Nichols
Margaret L. Moore
E. F. Schietinger